

Studies in Zoroastrian Exegesis:
Zand

Thesis submitted for the degree "Doctor of Philosophy"

by Dan Shapira

submitted to the Senate of the Hebrew University of

Jerusalem in 1998 / תשנ"ט

0925107



This work was carried out under the supervision
of Prof. Shaul Shaked

a
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	i-ii
An Additional Note	iii-iv
CHAPTER I Nasks Summarized: Dēnkard 8	1-40
CHAPTER II The Way of <i>Zand</i>	41-83
CHAPTER III Strange <i>Zand</i> Traditions	84-144
I Sleep and Sweat	84-93
II Arīš and Mahmī	94-104
III Mānī and <i>Zand</i>	105-134
IV Fire	135-144
CHAPTER IV Mythologization of History and Political Use of <i>Zand</i>	145-197
SUMMARY	198
ABBREVIATIONS	199-200
BIBLIOGRAPHY	201-241
א-ז	תקציר

INTRODUCTION

This work is a collection of studies dealing with some aspects of the *Zand* literature, the traditional Middle Persian, or Pahlavi, exegesis/translation of the sacred Avesta of the Zoroastrians. Here are edited considerable parts of the Zoroastrian Middle Persian *Dēnkard* (Dk) 8-9 and other Middle Persian texts that are translations or paraphrases of Avestan originals, mostly from the Pahlavi *Gāthā*. Some of these texts were edited previously, as separate passages, by modern scholars, but the bulk of the material found in this work appears in transliteration for the first time, while some of it is translated here for the first time.

These texts are crucial for understanding Late Sasanian Zoroastrianism, as it was the Middle Persian version of the Avestan Canon that this religion was based on. "All founded religions base themselves on large bodies of canonized texts" (Assmann 1992, 144) and Zoroastrianism is no exception.

Some remarks should be made about the problematics involved in the present work. The scholar of *Zand* encounters tremendous problems. He is supposed to study the exegesis, but exegesis of what? Even now, after more than a century of successful research, the Avestan texts remain still rather obscure to Avestan scholars themselves; one of the schools tends to read Avestan texts through the extant Pahlavi *Zand*, giving thus more credit to the Tradition, while another school tends to stress the Indo-European, and, especially, the Indic context. Different scholars disagree on numerous crucial points of the Avestan, especially, Gathic, texts, and one who studies the work of the Pahlavi translators of Avestan needs first to establish his/her personal view of the Avestan texts in question¹. Thus the work becomes a study in Avestan, not only in Pahlavi. Taking a stand regarding the Avestan texts is thus projected directly on one's evaluation of Pahlavi *Zands* of these Avestan texts. After much hesitation, I decided to provide not my own English renderings of Gathic texts, with few exceptions, but rather to adopt a particular already existing translation. I chose as my basis the translation of Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, which is a slightly revised version of Humbach 1991²; there are several reasons for this decision: my work is focused on Pahlavi translations from Avestan, not on Avestan studies; this translation, by and large, is just adequate; it is close to the autochthonous tradition, i.e., the Pahlavi tradition, and the translators themselves relied to some degree on the Pahlavi version. There is a catch, of course, as there is a danger of a circular argument, but, after all, some

¹ I feel urged to provide here some possible Jewish parallels: it is like one feels while studying the commentary by RaShi to Job, using for the "Hebrew" of Job, e.g., Tur-Sinai 1967, or a work of the school of Dahoud; or like trying to reconstruct the, say, lost original of Job, while having at his disposal only the Aramaic Targum of the type of [Pseudo-]Jonathan to the Pentateuch (not of the type of the actual Targum to Job that we possess).

² Which is very different from Humbach 1959.

translation must be taken as the basis.

Another problem is the character of the script in which the Pahlavi *Zands* appear. It is one of the most inadequate scripts ever existing, and the Pahlavi text, especially, when one deals with translations from Avestan, could be, theoretically, read in a variety of ways. The syntax of the Pahlavi translations from Avestan is another matter of horror: the translation follows Avestan word order, word by word, similarly to the way which was called in Biblical studies δουλεύων τῇ ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει. But while Avestan was an inflected language, Pahlavi lost cases at an early stage of its development and its word order should be very rigid. In addition, the Pahlavi versions of the *Gāθās* (and of other Avestan texts) contain numerous glosses planted in different epochs by different *Zandists*. Though much work was done by modern Zoroastrian editors of the *Zands* in order to single out the glosses, still, the glosses, sometimes, became so integral in the Pahlavi text that they pose additional problems of their own³.

Besides the *Zands* to the *Gāθās* proper, there are three different versions of the same texts surviving in excerpts in Dk 9. These quotations frequently provide readings which should be taken into consideration while editing the *Zand* of the *Gāθā* proper, not only while dealing with the exegesis (on this problem, cf. Chapter II).

So, one has to deal with several levels at the same time: what the Gathic text was supposed to mean by its author (Zoroaster?), how it was understood in later times by Zoroastrians (and by modern scholars), what was grasped by the four just mentioned (different) Pahlavi versions.

It was that ancient oral exegesis in Avestan, gradually replaced by other Iranian languages, that the Middle Persian version of the *Gāθās* represents. Thus, although its language was exposed to continuous updating⁴, thus being sometimes rather late while compared to other Zoroastrian Middle Persian texts, the Pahlavi *Gāθā* must keep some traces of exegesis going back to an epoch when some sort of Avestan was still spoken⁵. A sacred text is not complete without an additional interpretation⁶, this is especially true for the historical Zoroastrianism, firstly, because the Revelation given to Zoroaster was in a highly archaic language⁷, implanted into a milieu that, though Iranian, still differs linguistically; secondly, because the Religion of the Lord Wisdom, Ahura Mazda, emphasized conscious comprehension of religious duty.

³ I will deal with the problem of such integrated glosses elsewhere.

⁴ The Middle Persian versions of the Avesta were changed in time, cf. Skjærvø 1998, similarly to the way the Jewish Aramaic *Targums* were constantly updated.

⁵ The fact that the Avesta was transmitted mostly orally facilitated the preservation of understanding of these texts as it was current about Zoroaster's own times.

⁶ Wansbrough 1977, 100, 148-170.

⁷ Zoroaster's *Gāθās* belong to the most obscure religious texts.

There are two main purposes for which religious texts could be used, for study and for sacral usage, the idea behind it being that the mere pronouncement of a sacred text makes the work done. In case of sacral ancient languages, the believer makes use of a vernacular version, for the first purpose, but only the original language should be used for the second purpose.

As the Pahlavi Yasna was rarely read, having not the power of a *mantra*, differently from the original Avestan Yasna, its language, though sometimes brought up to date, is remarkably conservative, as was pointed out more than once; more conservative, I would add, than the parallel Dk 9 paraphrase, while the most popular texts were constantly modernized in order to make them understood by the users, as is the case of the Khorda Avesta, the Late Sasanian Prayer Book, whose Pahlavi sometimes looks entirely like New Persian. The upgrading of the Pahlavi Yasna was achieved by adding new glosses, not by changing the text.

The Pahlavi literature consists of three large groups of writings. It contains, firstly, Middle Persian translations of Avestan texts intermingled with Middle Persian *Zand*, or commentary [including glosses]. As the Avestan texts, and the *Gāθās* especially, are the core of Zoroastrianism, there is no doubt that from the earliest epoch of this religion these texts, in their oral form, were studied and explained to younger generations of Zoroastrians, at least to some of them, like priests.

The second group consists of original Middle Persian texts on religious subjects based directly or indirectly on the first group. The Bundahīšn (Bd) might be regarded as representative for this group⁸.

The third group consists of miscellaneous texts not necessarily connected with religion⁹, although the term *secular* does not fully apply to it. It was this third group that has supplied the greatest bulk of sources that were translated into Arabic.

⁸ From the Cihrdād and Dāmdād Nasks, cf. Darmesteter 1893, III, xivff.

⁹ West 1904b, 81.

The Sasanian Canon¹⁰ is extant now in several different, and sometimes parallel "redactions", to use West's expression. *Vendidad Sade*, being the first type of presentation of the Avestan corpus, contains Vendidad proper, Vispered and Yasna, all three combined and interwoven. The purpose of this collection is to be used in liturgyl. It is worth noting the prominence attributed to Vendidad, the only surviving Nask composed by Zoroastrianized Median Magi, a text including mostly pre-Zoroastrian and perhaps pre-Iranian material. As we possess both the Avestan original and the Middle Persian version, some estimate of the size of the lost parts of the Avesta, for which we still have their Middle Persian *Zands* might be made, projecting from Vendidad's volume. E.g., Duchesne-Guillemin 1962, 31, suggested that we possess only about a quarter of the Sasanian Avesta, since only about one-fourth of the Avestan quotations traced in the Pahlavi are found in the extant Avesta. A comparison of the Middle Persian version of Vendidad with the summary of Vendidad in Dēnkard 8 suggests that the Dēnkard's redaction was made from a Middle Persian commentary on the Pahlavi Vendidad, which was shorter than the extant Middle Persian Vendidad. The Vendidad was used for both ritual and study, as it contains laws. These are the reasons why the Avestan text has survived, and why we still possess its Pahlavi rendering.

The second presentation is Zand Avesta proper arranged for study purposes. This redaction contains a Middle Persian translation, and the Avestan texts are arranged in a different order, reminiscent of that described in Dēnkard 8.

As we know from different Middle Persian texts, the study of *Zand* was a religious duty [cf. Dēnkard quotations in Junker 1912a¹¹]. Moreover, some knowledge of Avestan was required for manthric purposes, as the priest was required to pronounce the Word of God properly.

The Khorda Avesta (=XA) contains some Avestan and Middle Persian texts being, in all probability, a Sasanian redaction of the prayer book format, derived from abbreviated Avestan texts. The Yašt collection is generally held to be a part of XA. It is interesting to note that the only Yašts we possess in Middle Persian are those used in the ritual (XA); at the same time, Yašts were extremely frequently drawn upon in Bundahišn-like texts¹².

10 The Judaeo-Christian notion of "Canon" is strange to Zoroastrianism, as all the wisdom of the world emanates from the revelation given to Zoroaster. That is why in the Late Sasanian Period the "Avestan Corpus" (in Pahlavi) was growing.

11 Cf., e.g., Junker 1912a, 15: "the duty of boys, created by God, is to go to school", x^v ēškārīh [i] rēdagān ēn [i] parān dibtristān, x^v adāy.dād ēstēd; for parān cf. Junker 1912a, 11-2, 15, n.1. Study of religious texts was, no doubt, the essence of the learning at that school.

12 On some quotations from the Yašts cf. further.

As the bulk of the Sasanian Avesta in its original tongue was lost, it is almost by chance that Afreni Dahmān, or Aōgenadaēca, together with Erbedestān and Nērangestān, provide us with some other unidentified Avestan quotations¹³ in Middle Persian texts. It must be supposed that these texts are another type of an Avestan-Middle Persian corpus being a shorter redaction from the same source as Zand-Avesta and XA. As already said, the texts that survived in Avestan are mostly those used on a daily basis by priests. The Gāthās, Vendidad, and, with some reservations, Erbedestān and Nērangestān are among such texts.

Late Sasanian and Post-Sasanian Zoroastrianism, as we know it from the Middle Persian 9th century books, far from being monolithic in itself, represented only one variant of beliefs current in Iran in those epochs.

As the status of Scriptures, "the Holy Scriptures" in our sense, was very different in Iran¹⁴, and those were the priests who transmitted texts, it is only natural that they selected the texts that were to be transmitted¹⁵.

Dēnkard, an enormous compendium of Late Sasanian Wisdom, is a composite collection of various materials of gnomic, legendary and *Zand* traditions. The *Zand* traditions in the strict sense, the main aim of this work, are the subject of the last two "books", while the origins and, especially, the status of the initial "books" inside the "Sasanian Canon" are still questionable. It was presupposed that the source of some parts of the Dk must be the Nigēz, a bigger compilation. This Nigēz, of whose the Dēnkard is an abbreviated revision, was perhaps a whole Middle Persian redaction of the Sasanian Avesta in the ancient tongue¹⁶.

13 In Aōgenadaēca, only 5 of the 29 quotations may be traced to the extant Avesta, West 1904b, 89.

14 The Written Corpus as such, with clear boundaries, was arranged only in the Islamic era for the purpose of obtaining the status of *ṣaḥīḥ* *ḥikāḥ*; true, it may be the reason, or, rather one of the reasons, for composing the so-called 9th Century Books. But these books, like the Dēnkard or Bundahišn, were not "sacred": they did not pretend to have the status of Revelation. At best, they may be compared to some *fiqh* or *ir* works in Islamic literature.

15 In this context, it is worth noting that profound changes happened in the post-Sasanian Zoroastrian attitudes to priests and "Holy Writings": Zoroastrian priests are important in the modern Parsi tradition of Hindu India, not in Islamic Iran, while scripture is seen as central in a Muslim environment, less so in India, cf. Hinnells 1994, 85-6. It is perhaps the impact of this Muslim environment that encouraged literary traditions in Iran to be better preserved, as compared with India, until recent times.

16 Cf. Tavania 1956, 52.

Of the original nine Dēnkard books, the first two were lost. Dk 3 is translated in de Menasce 1973; Dk 5 is partly translated in West 1897¹⁷ and edited in Molé 1967, Dk 6 is edited in Shaked 1979, Dk 7 is partly translated in West 1897 and edited and translated in Molé 1967, Dk 8 & 9 are translated in West 1892¹⁸. Besides, many individual passages were edited and translated by different authors¹⁹. As to the original text, there are three basic editions: Sanjana 1874-1928 (vol. I-XIX) [=Dks²⁰], Madan 1911 (vol. I-II) [=DkM²¹] and Dresden 1966 [=DkD].

The accounts of the Avestan Nasks²² given in Dk 8 and 9 are derived from an interlinear *Zand* in a shortened form. It is worth noting that some Avestan texts were no longer available in their Middle Persian. Three groups of the 21 Avestan Nasks are summarized in Dk 8, and three of the seven Gathic Nasks are summarized at length in Dk 9.

It is mostly the S[t]ūdgār and Waršt mānsār sections of Dk 9 that the present work deals with. The Bagān Nask, which has a legal character, and which interprets each verse by recourse to analogy²³, is to some degree neglected in this work. This Bagān Nask was one of the seven Dādīg Nasks dealing mostly with legal material, but it had, together with Cīhrdād Nask, a rather ambivalent status inside the Dādīg group of the Nasks²⁴. The Bagān Nask was also partly of Gāōānīg, "Gāōic", character, while the Cīhrdād Nask was of Hadā-mānōrīg character²⁵. Judging from the way in which this Bagān Nask was summarized in Dk 9, it was a real *Zand* for studying in which the disciple-teacher relations are stressed, and it seems that these three Nasks (since Book 9 of the Dēnkard gives so much space to them) in their Middle Persian summary served as a basis for teaching in the Late Sasanian period and shortly afterwards, when Avestan was little known outside the clergy, but Pahlavi still functioned as a living literary language.

¹⁷ Most of the Pahlavi texts were translated by West and published between 1880-5 as *Pahlavi Texts*, vol. I-5, in the *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. V, VII, XVI, XVII, XXIV.

¹⁸ I hope to publish Dk 8-9 later.

¹⁹ E.g., Molé 1963.

²⁰ Quoted by volume and page (e.g., Dks XIX, 25).

²¹ Quoted by page (e.g., DkM 715).

²² The Avestan Nasks were estimated to have been containing originally as much as 345,000 words, and about 2,000,000 words in their Middle Persian version, West 1892, xiv-xlv.

²³ Cf. de Menasce 1983, 1175.

²⁴ Cf. further, DkM 678; cmp. West 1892, 7.

²⁵ On these terms cf. further.

In the end of Dk 9 one finds a chapter which contains many quotations from unknown texts, and a long succession of detached phrases from the Pahlavi Gāōās strung together²⁶, as descriptive of the final triumph of religion. The Gathic passages found in this chapter are of great help for drawing comparisons with the Pahlavi Gathas proper²⁷.

According to the Dēnkard, under the Sasanians there were already only 348 chapters = 21 Nasks = 345.700 words [the estimation of West], of which only 83.000 words are now extant, 1/4 of the original Sasanian Avesta. According to the tradition, it was Alexander who burned the Avesta, but it is not clear whether a text already existed at that time. From the Achaemenian until the Late Sasanian period the text steadily grew; the "canon" took shape as Zoroastrianism spread, while the Gāōās held a small, but central and honorary place in it.

In the Greco-Roman World, many pseudo-epigrapha were spread under the name of Zoroaster, or of his close associates, like *Zostrianos*²⁸, in Coptic, or the Greek *Ostanes* and others²⁹; some of the material included might be genuine and old. According to the Iranian view, expressed in Sasanian texts, Avesta was "stolen" by the Greeks and translated into their language. That is why the Iranians lost large parts of their traditional wisdom and later they found themselves urged to restore it and translate it back into Iranian.

Some scholars³⁰ believed that the theory of Avesta brought to Greece and there translated, was merely a pious legend, fabricated in the Parthian period to explain the lack of written literature; Nyberg 1938, 424-5, called this theory a phantasy; however, Geldner 1904, 32-6, Jackson 1904, 691, Henning 1942, accepted it as generally trustworthy, as Altheim 1949, 18, 28, Haug 1884, Dhalla 1922, 40, Brown 1951, i.97, did³¹. According to the same Iranian theory, the Greeks (i.e., Macedonians) not only took hold of the Avesta, they also burnt parts of it. Nevertheless, it was after the Arab invasion, not the Greek one, that books were burnt down systematically: for XVārazm, at least, we are aware of an elaborate Arab practice of destroying

²⁶ Cf. West 1892, SBE XXXVII, pp. XLV-XLV; West 1904b, 98.

²⁷ Cf. further.

²⁸ The title is, however, modern; "Zostrianos/Zoroaster" appears in the colophon.

²⁹ Cf. Boyce & Grenet 1991, 491-565, "Thus spake not Zarathuštra".

³⁰ Olmstead 1948, 476; Herzfeld 1934, 53.

³¹ Cf. Eddy 1962, 14 n.22.

cultural and literary treasures of non-Arabs³².

Arabic sources frequently mention Avesta as a book; these sources, together with New Persian Zoroastrian texts, and classical authors, were first used by Thomas Hyde in his book *Historia religionis veterum persarum, partharum et mediarum*, which appeared in 1700. It was not until 1770 that authentic [other than New Persian] Zoroastrian sources became known in Europe³³, when Anquetil-Duperron translated the Bundahišn into French; later, in 1771, he also published French versions of Avestan texts, in three volumes, under the title *Ouvrage de Zoroastre*. It seems like it was by him that the erroneous term *Zend-Avesta* was introduced to Europe.

Since then, Avestan studies came to prominence at the very early stages of Indo-European comparativistics, and names like F. Bopp, R. Rask, E. Burnouf are associated with them. It was Rask, who in 1826 first showed the close affinity between Avestan and Sanskrit, and later, the relation between Avestan and Old Persian was established.

Two trends were current in Avestan studies: the traditional school, represented by F. Spiegel, J. Darmesteter, F. Justi, de Harlez, W. Geiger, which relied upon the autochthonous Zoroastrian interpretation of the Avesta, as represented by *Zand*, and the comparative-historical, or "Vedic", school, going back to R. Roth, which relied mostly on the evidence furnished by Indic texts. Although both schools became aware that their respective methods were legitimate and dangerous at the same time³⁴, some echoes of these schools still may be heard in works of H. Humbach and in those of S. Insler and J. Kellens, respectively.

32 Bīrūnī (tr. Sachau 1879, 58) reported that "after Qutaiba ben Muslim Albāhili had killed their {Khwarezmians'} learned men and priests, and had burned their books and writings, they became entirely illiterate (forgot writing and reading), and relied in every knowledge or science which they required solely upon memory". This tradition could be easily dismissed, of course, as legendary (and based on the accounts of older disasters), whose aim was to provide an explanation why Xthārazmian Zoroastrians possessed no Book, as required from a People of the Book by the new Muslim rulers.

33 Although an Avestan Yasna M5 seems to have been brought to Canterbury in 1633, and in 1723 a copy of Vendidad Sade was deposited in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, cf. Jackson 1892, xiii.

34 Cf. Kellens 1989, 41.

Between 1886-1895 a critical text of the Avesta was published by K. Geldner, and in 1892-3 Darmesteter's second, French, translation of the Avesta appeared. Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (AiW; 1904) is still perhaps among the best dictionaries of any language³⁵. The Gāthās were translated, i.e., in Bartholomae 1905, Wilkins Smith 1929, Duchesne-Guillemin 1948 and 1952 (an English version by M. Henning), Humbach 1959, Insler 1975, Kellens & Pirart 1988, 1990, 1991, and finally Humbach 1991. The non-Gāthic Avesta was translated, after Bartholomae's AiW, in Wolff 1910, whose translation replaced, in some aspects, that of Darmesteter.

Script and Book

But did a written Avestan text exist prior to its fixation during the late Sasanian rule? The extant Avesta is written in a highly precise, beautiful alphabet, of undoubtedly Aramaic origin. Andreas 1902-3³⁶ believed in an archetype written in the Aramaic script proper³⁷. Andreas's theory dealt mostly with the alphabet; according to this theory, the Arsacid Avesta, codified (as the Pahlavi tradition informs us) under one of the Parthian kings whose name was Vologeses, was written down in a plain, non-vocalized, Aramaic script. All the linguistic problems of the extant Avestan texts can be explained once we rediscover the form in which a particular Avestan form was registered in this supposed archetypal "Arsacid Avesta". According to this theory, the transposition of Avestan texts from their "Arsacid" form into the extant "Sasanian" form was mechanical. An example: Yasna 28.1, *ahyā yāsa nāmaghā* was reconstructed as **hy' y's' nwmwh'*, interpreted as **ohyo yā^x sā^x nomohā^x*. Following Andreas, many authors, e.g., Pagliaro & Bausani³⁸ and others, believed that the Avesta was transmitted in written form. The theory was slightly modified in Junker 1925-6, Lommel 1927 and Altheim 1949; Altheim's idea on the rise of the vocalized Avestan script in the East³⁹ is not without interest⁴⁰; Djakonov & Livshits⁴¹ supposed that a written version existed in Parthia as early as the first century BCE.

35 Cf. Henning 1942, 145.

36 Also in Andreas & Wackernagel 1909, 1911, 1913, 1931.

37 Geiger's supposition is less rigid and assumes also some impact of an oral tradition.

38 Pagliaro & Bausani 1960, 44.

39 In the "Hellenized" Arsacid Parthia; after the Bactrian model.

40 Altheim 1949 rightly argued that the vocalization of the consonant Arameo-Pahlavi was due to Greek influence. The case of the contemporary Armenian and, perhaps, Georgian, examples, must be added, where scripts deriving shapes of their letters from Aramaic/Pahlavi were built on the Greek principles, using even some Byzantine Greek orthographical conventions. However, while speaking of the Greek writing principles, one has to bear in mind that Byzantium was not the only country using the Greek script - another one was Bactria, at some periods a part of the Sasanian Empire. One has not to underestimate the possibility of the impact of the so-called "Manichaean" script.

41 Cf. further.

Although Andreas' theory contained some highly inspiring insights, it led scholarship in a wrong way for too long. For more than forty years the principle of graphic restoration was universally applied in Avestan studies. During World War II, almost at the same time and independently, counter-arguments were brought by Bailey, Henning, Morgenstierne; Bailey 1943, 151-194, denied the existence of the hypothetical Arsacid text, while Henning 1942 and Morgenstierne 1942 [1944] did not deny the existence of such a text, but rather emphasized its unimportance for the Avestan studies. It is now thought that most of the mistakes in the Avestan texts took places during the later history of the Sasanian Avesta, not during the presumed transposition from the *Arsacid Avesta to the Sasanian one⁴². It may be argued that the growth of mistakes was among the factors that gave rise to the invention of the "Avestan" alphabet. The Avesta is a corpus for reciting, not for study. The Western sources dealing with Zoroastrianism speak of "*psalmody*"⁴³, not of "*books*". The different character of the Christian and the Zoroastrian terminology as applied to "books" was noted by Christensen 1944, 516. The Christian books are for study, denying the ritual dimensions of the Judaism, while the most sacred Zoroastrian "texts" are for reciting, serving for a cultic purpose. But, it is to be stressed that, in my opinion, the idea behind the invention of the Avestan alphabet was not preservation of the text as such, but conservation of its *phonetical* form, setting the norm for reciting priests.

We know that while Avestan words and even whole phrases are transcribed in "Book Pahlavi", as in Dk 8 & 9, some weird orthographic conventions peculiar to the Avestan words only were in use. This makes sense only if there was a tradition of writing down Avestan in the Pahlavi script prior to the invention of the Avestan alphabet.

The question of dating the invention of the Avestan alphabet is interconnected, thus, with the date of the codification of the Avestan Corpus. There are divergent opinions as to the dates of the supposed codification of the Avesta: the 4th century, Reichelt 1913, 53, Morgenstierne 1942, Henning 1942, Hoffmann 1970, Hoffmann & Narten 1989; the middle of the 6th century, Bailey 1943, 172; the middle of the 7th century, Pagliaro & Bausani 1960, 49. Bailey 1943, 180, dates the archetype of our copies of the Avesta somewhere between the time of the early Manichaean texts and the time of Manuščīhr (circa 880 CE), on the grounds of the sound-change /r-/ > /s/ attested in the written Avesta, but still absent from the Manichaean and Arabic evidence. However, it seems safe to state that some written copies of some Avestan texts in some [more than one] scripts existed prior to the invention of the so-called "Avestan alphabet" in the Late Sasanian period, as we know from the Sogdian transliteration of an Avestan text⁴⁴.

42 Cf. MacKenzie 1987, 30b.

43 Cf. Nau 1927; Christensen 1944, 515ff.

44 Cf. Gershevitch 1976a.

Sometimes, wrong etymologies were used to argue that a written Avestan text existed at an earlier period: an attempt was made⁴⁵ to derive the Parthian [from Nisa] name of the 14th day, *gwyrh*, from Avestan *gāuš urund*⁴⁶. This etymology implies that *yrh* represented the Avestan voiceless *r*, being a graphemic prototype for the sign *𐬨*³, i.e., 𐬨*, of the Avestan *Vulgata*. Thus, the assumption that *gwyrh* is a pseudo-historical spelling used instead of **gws* presupposes that a written text of at least some parts of the Avesta existed in Eastern Parthia as early as the 1st century BCE. However, the Avestan alphabet was invented towards the end of the Sasanian period, judging from the fact that the Avestan characters are derived from the 4th-6th century Book Pahlavi (the forms of the Turfan Psalter characters are more conservative⁴⁷). The Avestan alphabet did not exist in Mani's time, otherwise Mani would probably have used it⁴⁸. Instead, he used a Syriac alphabet close to that used at Palmyra. It was rather the Manichaean alphabet itself that left some impact on the Avestan script, although in an indirect form (borrowing of the principle of vocalization). All the Book Pahlavi characters of the 6th century were used with the same value in the Avestan alphabet: 𐬨 = a, with Avestan 𐬨 = ā and 𐬨 = â being modifications, 𐬨 = i, 𐬨 = ī being a modification, 𐬨 used in Book Pahlavi for w and o, u, ō, ū, in Avestan for u, 𐬨 = Avestan ū being a modification, 𐬨 = k, Avestan 𐬨 = γ being a modification, 𐬨 = t, Avestan 𐬨 and 𐬨 = δ being modifications, 𐬨 = p, Avestan 𐬨 = f and 𐬨 = β being modification, 𐬨 = b, 𐬨 = m, Avestan 𐬨 being a modification, 𐬨 = n, 𐬨 = r, 𐬨 (r in Avestan, the Avestan for l being a modification of it, 𐬨), 𐬨 = s, 𐬨 = z, 𐬨 = š, with two Avestan modification of it, 𐬨 = š, and 𐬨 = ȝ, 𐬨 = x^v, Avestan 𐬨 = ȝ being a modification of it, etc.; especially important are the cases of Avestan 𐬨 = o and 𐬨 = ō.

45 According to Djakonov & Livshits 1966, 149, 153-157 [esp. 156-7] & 172-3.

46 However, according to Gershevitch 1969, 197 (quoted without references also by Livshits apud Bickerman 1970, 327 n. 18), who compared it to the corresponding Khvarazmian 𐬨𐬨𐬨, this Parthian day-name means "cow-day" (**gav-ayan*).

47 Skjærvø 1983a has shown that the Turfan Psalter was composed not long after the great inscriptions of the Early Sasanian period, but, while in the inscriptions there is no system of phonetic complements, in the Psalter one finds a regular system with minor orthographic variants, and sometimes phonetic and ideographic spellings interchange, to obtain variation. Skjærvø 1983a, 179, stated that the Middle Persian of the translator was his mother tongue [pace Gignoux 1969], and the awkwardness in phrasing is due to the Syriac original. The situation is, in fact, very similar to that with the Judeo-Persian Bible translations.

48 Mani blamed the Zoroastrians for distorting the words of their prophet in their books, because the Avestan Prophet himself was oral, as Mani knew well. This means, they did have some books, but these were not those by the Prophet. The situation with Islam is somewhat similar: their prophet was ignorant of letters, but he called his revelation a "Book". It is possible that Qurʾān, a much discussed word, was influenced, both phonetically and semantically, in the sense of "appeal", by the Manichaean xorūs, "Call", the term which was later rendered, in its turn, as dāʿwa.

These letters are derived directly from a modification of the Book Pahlavi *z*, *k*, used in Middle Persian transcription of Avestan words, like *uruuδ* = *ʾwrrw[w]k*. The implication of this fact is that even prior to the invention of the Avestan alphabet (or, prior to the last stages of the development of a form of the Book Pahlavi script into Avestan as we know it) there existed some orthographic conventions of recording Avestan by means of the Pahlavi script. As mentioned above, many Avestan words in Dk 8-9 are still written not in Avestan characters, but in Pahlavi script in accordance with the orthography specific for "Avesticisms" only, thus continuing perhaps the scribal traditions of an older written fixation.

Whether some parts of the Avesta did exist in some written form[s] prior to the invention of the Avestan script⁴⁹ or not (I believe, they did), this is without importance for Avestan studies proper. And even if some mistakes in the transmission of the Avesta may go to an "Aramaic", i.e., Pahlavi⁵⁰, transliteration (as the Andreas' theory in its "classical form" states), nevertheless, it would be of minor importance, too, as the transmission was basically oral⁵¹, even until recently, when written and printed texts already were available.

In order to illustrate the oral character of transmission, one may quote Abdīh ī Sagastān where it is stated that

nask ēw būd. <abāg> zanān būd aburnāyag ēw nask ēw ī *Bagānēz

xvānēnd warm kard ēstād padāz hān brēh dēn andar Sagastān abāz gašt, ud ārast ud wīrast nawag nawag, bē pad Sagastān anyē, abārtīg gyāg nē warm,

49 Shaked 1979, xxxii, saw it as possible that some copies of the Avesta did exist in Sasanian times; as to a switch from one alphabet to another, for a revered corpus, compare the Hebrew Bible which was transcribed once from the Paleo-Hebrew into the Jewish square script.

50 That the Avesta was previously written down in an alphabet of the Aramaeo-Pahlavi type is treated as a generally accepted fact, e.g., in Schlerath 1987, 30.

51 Was a copy of the Avesta polluted if touched by a non-Zoroastrian? We do not know. It is quite possible that we do not hear much of the Avesta from, say, Syriac sources just because it was not shown to the "Gentiles" (Nau 1927 argued, basing himself on Syriac polemic works, that the tradition known to the Sasanian Zoroastrians was purely oral and they had no books). On the other hand, the mere possibility that a huge corpus, written or oral, which was preserved memorized by heart by numerous clerics, was so easily gone, may tell us something about the real acquaintance with the text, written or oral. It is worth also noting that, differently from the Mediterranean civilizations, no speculations about the sacred nature of the Avestan or Pahlavi letters are known from Iran.

there was a Nask, kept with women, and a boy was trained to memorize this one Nask, called⁵² Bagān, and in this way the Religion returned to Sistān, and it (the Nask) was arranged and ordered anew, and there was no memory⁵³ of (this Nask) in any other place except Sistān.

This implies that even in the post-Sasanian period texts were still transmitted orally by memory. It seems that Sistān especially was known for its prominence in the oral transmission of the Avesta: al-Bīrūnī, quoted in Bailey 1943, 161-2, tells us that one particular Zoroastrian in Sistān had recited the whole Avesta by heart, but this phenomenon seems to be rare even in Sistān.

As to a written text, whether such a text existed or not, the authors of the Dēnkard do not clearly distinguish between Abistāg in the sense of the Pahlavi version of the Avestan and the Avestan text in Avestan, cf. Bailey 1943, 167; Tavadia 1956, 48, does not tend to distinguish, having been based on Wikander, between the written Niwēg and the oral Abistāg, cf. DkM 412.11f.

On the other hand, a specimen of "fifteenth-century Pahlavi as written in Iran", an extract from the Middle Persian introduction to the Pahlavi Yasna, MS Pt4, printed in West 1904b, 84-5, states that "NN had written a copy for himself - the Avesta from one copy, and the Zand from another copy ...", Abistag az paccēn ē, ud Zand az paccēn ē ... xvēš rāy nibišt ēstād ...

We know of manuscripts in which the Avestan text is interspersed with Pahlavi, but there are also manuscripts where only the plain Avestan (Sādeh) or only the plain Pahlavi MSs are given.

According to Bailey 1943, 193-4, the known Avestan text is a result of a Post-Sasanian text going back to Late Sasanian [VI CE] codification; the boundaries of that "Late Sasanian Avesta" were flexible, and it is interesting that the incorporation of the Greek and Indian material into the late Sasanian Avesta was contemporary with the invention of the "Avestan" alphabet.

52 As to the translation, compare Utas 1976, 263.

53 warm kardan means "to memorize, to learn by heart", New Persian yād giriftan. Perhaps, "this Nask was memorized in no other place except Sistān".

Now a few words must be said about the history of the script used for Zoroastrian Middle Persian. This language used a system of writing designated as Pahlavi which is closely reminiscent of Akkadian, Korean or Japanese models. This is to say, Aramaic words were written, or, were supposed to be written, in Aramaic, but were actually read in Iranian. This way of substituting Iranian for Aramaic was called *uzwārišn*⁵⁴. This system is by no means more weird than that of our digits, pronounced differently in different languages, but commonly understood in the same manner whatever their phonetic value.

Djakonov 1986 emphasized the mnemonic importance of writing which is indifferent to the reproduction of the flow of speech, and the prestige value of some types of writing; the latter point was, separately, emphasized by Skalmowski⁵⁵. In Mesopotamia, as in Iran, *farhangs* were learned by heart, and texts written in Sumerian or in Aramaic were, nevertheless, read in Akkadian or in Old [Middle] Persian [Parthian, etc.] respectively, as the Japanese read their *kanji* symbols in their own language, not in Ancient Chinese.

Djakonov noted that some "isogrammatems" analogous to those in Old Persian could be found in Akkadian, Aramaic and, especially, Urartian writing systems, but nothing specific was found in Elamite⁵⁶.

While Syromedia, with its huge Semitic population of colonists, might be the homeland of both "Aryan", i.e., Iranian [not Persian]⁵⁷ cuneiform and the Irano-Aramaic writing known later as "Pahlavi" etc., Persis, with its mostly Elamite population, had no known early Aramaic scribal traditions⁵⁸.

54 There are traces of *uzwārišn* system in Sogdian, especially in the Buddhist texts, but it is absent from the Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian, cf. Bailey 1953, 186.

55 In his lecture in Jerusalem in summer 1994.

56 The use of cuneiform writing in Western Iran was widespread prior to Indo-European penetration; Lullubi, Gutian, Kassite and other populations, not to mention Elamites, used it, Schmitt 1993, 457.

57 Gershevitch 1964; Gershevitch 1979.

58 The unbroken Elamite cuneiform scribal tradition was continued in the Achaemenian trilingual rock inscriptions, Schmitt 1993, 458.

The Aramaic chancelleries were a Median invention as well, while the Achaemenids continued to rely on Elamophone scribes⁵⁹. Thus, the situation of parallel usage of several languages in different scripts, in the earlier stage of the Achaemenian Commonwealth⁶⁰, was a bit reminiscent of that of the early period of occupation of the old Near Eastern civilized lands by primitive Islamic Arabs, where Greek, Coptic and Pahlavi, but not Arabic, were in use in the administration. Only gradually, the Achaemenian Persians gave preference to the Aramaic characters, using them for their Iranian speech, as perhaps in the case with the "Darius Tomb Aramaic inscription" (on which cf. Sims-Williams 1981).

The language designated as literary "Old Persian" was not actually Persian, as it has different dialectal forms of Iranian words as compared to the Elamite versions of the Achaemenian inscriptions - in Elamite the Iranian loan words were borrowed from the spoken language, i.e., from genuine Old Persian, while the "Old Persian" as written continued Median traditions⁶¹. We know that the Achaemenids used Aramaic⁶² and Elamite for their business activities, while the Median cuneiform writing, called "Old Persian" served only for representative purposes⁶³.

It is unlikely to suppose, may it be remarked, that an Avestan text ever existed in cuneiform, while there are some short Avestan or quasi-Avestan Iranian texts in Aramaic script (cf., e.g., Bogoliubov 1971). Thus, the only logical writing device to represent the everyday Iranian speech was Aramaic, both the language and the script. According to Djakonov, the transfer from purely Iranian to "Pahlavi" took four stages:

59 According to Gershevitch 1985, the Old Persian texts are actually Elamite in Iranian words, similarly to some Aramaic texts from Egypt (which are, so to say, "Old Persian in Aramaic words", but not to the same degree). This observation of Gershevitch does not contradict with the fact the "Old Persian" used by the Elamophone scribes was actually "Literary Median", called "Aryan".

60 It is worth notice that the Scroll of Esther reflecting Arsacid realities speaks about "royal orders sent to each nation in its own language and writing" ("characters").

61 It seems that some graphic peculiarities of the Old Persian cuneiform signs were drawn upon from an Urartian model (cf. Schmitt 1993, 458 and Ghirshman 1962), while the principle was that of Aramaic (as in later times, the graphic form of Aramaic [Pahlavi] and the principle of Greek [or Armenian, or Manichaean] was used in inventing the Avestan script; another parallel is represented by the Indian scripts, also of Aramaic origin).

62 According to von Voigtlander 1978, 7, Darius was a native Iranian speaker, not necessarily (because his father Hystaspes ruled in Parthia) of Old Persian, knowing some Aramaic, and while dictating his edict, Darius spoke in an acquired language, Aramaic, perhaps; the Elamite and the Babylonian scribes were listening to the same dictation.

63 Monumental rock-inscriptions in cuneiform are peculiar to Urartian and Old Persian traditions. In Urartu, they used cuneiform script not only for rock-inscriptions, but also for deeds, annals and other records, while in the Achaemenian Empire, Elamite was used for economic documentation. However, Aramaic was later used, alongside with Elamite, for this purpose (Naveh & Shaked 1973). We have nothing in Iranian cuneiform comparable to Urartian annals, but some Avestan quotations translated into Old Persian, were found in the rock-inscriptions (Skjærvø 1998). One of the reasons might be that only few Iranian speakers were at hand in that period, having no economical or administrative training, and all scribal functions were taken by speakers of Elamite or Aramaic. Even in the Parthian Period, there was an urge to call Vištāspa's scribe Abraham (Ayādgār ī Zarērān), who was Jewish (on this Abraham as a Jew cf. Schaefer 1930, 93-4; now cf. Russell 1992 *pace* Monchi-Zadeh 1981).

- 1 the text written by a bilingual scribe in Aramaic and 𐎠𐎵𐎲𐎡𐎴 in Iranian⁶⁴;
- 2 standard formulas of translation from Aramaic into Iranian and from Iranian into Aramaic developed;
- 3 any standard text read by an Iranian scribe could be read either in Iranian or in Aramaic;
- 4 purely heterographic, when the whole text, both the standard one in "Aramaic" or Aramaic with Iranian inclusions (like borrowed words, so frequent in Egyptian Aramaic), written in the same script, could be read only in Iranian: "the grid of easily identifiable Aramaic heterograms gave the reader at once a general notion of the contents of the text and helped to identify the contiguous non-vocalized Iranian words. Anyone who knows cuneiform, knows that heterograms, far from hampering easy reading, actually are of a great help to the reader" [*ibid.*, 237].

It is not easy to decide when the *uzwārišn* Aramaic⁶⁵ became Pahlavi; Harmatta 1957, 298, gave the date of *circa* 150 BCE, cf. Henning 1958, 34: under Mithridates I [171-139 BCE]; Djakonov & Livshits 1960, 54, argued for a date not earlier than the 2nd century BCE; cf. Harmatta 1984, 224-5, who argued, again, for the first half of the 2nd century BCE under the reign of Phraortes I and completed under Mithridates I about the middle of the same century with the creation of the logographic Parthian system of writing, later inherited by the Persian Sasanians. As to Harmatta's theory of the impact of the occupation of Mesopotamia by Mithridates the First [he suggested that there are some similarities in the creation of a new writing system in a hurry at the king's order], Djakonov stated that this clear influence might have taken place even earlier⁶⁶, sticking to the traditional view expressed by Henning.

The Middle Persian logography goes back to the same prototype as the Parthian and other Aramaic-based Middle Iranian logographies, while at Armazi we see a different repertory of ideograms, and, an alphabet connected to the North-Mesopotamian scripts rather than to those of Parthia or Persis. It implies that the process was rather a gradual one, without "big jumps".

Thus, basically, the theory of Henning 1958, modified by Djakonov, must be generally upheld, with the exception of his chronology: the transfer to the "Pahlavi" type of writing, as we know it from Book Pahlavi, took place a century or so earlier than Henning believed, in the middle of the third century BCE, and the Darius Tomb inscription was not "*der einzige Versuch ... ohne*

64 Cf. below.

65 The question of Irano-Aramaic mutual impact is not an easy one either: it is sometimes difficult to decide whether certain phenomena are Semitic or Iranian, cf., e.g., Greenfield 1975, esp. p. 312.

66 The first fixation of Iranian speech by Aramaic script: Arehsun N^o1 and a gloss in a deed from the 5th century BCE, Kraeling 1953, N^o9: DDYMY-*dādāyām* a^hyāy-*YHBT* (Bogoliubov 1971, 283-4). Darius' tomb Aramaic, according to Henning, is to be dated by the first half of the 3rd century BCE, but Bogoliubov 1971, 283, dated it earlier.

Nachwirkung geblieben", Henning 1958, 24⁶⁷. In Aśoka's inscriptions we find early examples (qštn) to render Middle Iranian speech by means of a Semitic alphabet, alongside Middle Indian passages in Taxila⁶⁸. The Arehsun inscriptions were considered by Schaefer 1930, 201, and Rosenthal 1939, 28-9, as Achæmenian. According to an important article by Bogoliubov 1971, they are of the same type as the Darius Tomb inscription⁶⁹.

It is interesting to note that some Iranian loan words in Aramaic were used as heterograms, cf. Djakonov & Livshits 1960, 38-9: M6WŠH, M6WŠY⁷⁰, GNZ⁷¹, PTP, ṽTPH [compare Qandahar I, mšzty⁷², "the elders"; MRṽY, MRWHY⁷¹, thus indicating a long tradition going back to the period when the language of writing and reading was real Aramaic.

It seems that under the Achæmenians, the Aramaic script began to be used for different languages: for Late Old Persian / Early Middle Persian (Darius Tomb inscription⁷²), for Middle Iranian of the inscriptions from Cappadocia, Pakistan and Afghanistan, perhaps, also from Georgia⁷³, and for Hebrew⁷⁴.

67 As to the Aramaic inscriptions at Persepolis, an attempt was made to read the second Aramaic inscription on the stone window of the "Palace of Darius" at Persepolis, Frye 1984, 264.

68 Cf. Shaked in Kutscher, Naveh & Shaked 1970.

69 Bogoliubov adds also examples of Aramaic renderings of Iranian phrases from Egypt.

70 Cf. Humbach 1974, 238 n.4, about M6WŠY⁷⁰ used as a heterogram for *hērbād*, Frahang 13,2; the identification was explained by Hoffmann as the result of a fusion of two traditions, those of the Median Magi and those of Eastern *aēθrapatāi*; that looks plausible, and I would add that many Israelis speaking to Arabs, even in Hebrew, refer to Jewish rabbis as *hāxām*; on the other hand, many secular native Hebrew-speaking Israelis use *rabi* as their word for what must be designated in standard Hebrew as *raḅ*. And, this modern Hebrew usage is a borrowing from the English [American] "rabbi" (influenced by the Yiddish-originated usage of their parents). Another example may be the modern Israeli usage of *kōšer* versus the standard *kašer*, also influenced by American.

71 Which might be an Indo-Iranian ["Mitannic"] loan word in Aramaic, from *marta- [the word has no Semitic etymology; however, cf. Ugaitic and Hebrew MRR, "to be strong"].

72 Not to be confused with an Aramaic version of the Behistun texts, cf. Sims-Williams 1981.

73 The "second" long inscription from Armazi-Mcxtē'a, from the Arsacid period, was partly published and translated in Tsereteli (G.V.) 1943 and Tsereteli (V.G.) 1962; is by no means in Aramaic. The translation of Altheim & Stiehl 1961 (who took it as being in Aramaic) is absolutely fantastic; for the "first" (bilingual) inscription, cf. Donner & Röllig 1971-76, II, 328, No. 276.

74 Cf. the well known saying in Talmud Bavli, Sanherdin 21b,

בְּהַחֲלֵה נִתְּנָה תּוֹרָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכּוּחַ עֵבֶר וּבְכּוּחַ אֲשֻׁרִי וּבְכּוּחַ אַרְמִי, בִּדְרֵי כָּלן
בְּהַחֲלֵה נִתְּנָה תּוֹרָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכּוּחַ אֲשֻׁרִי וּבְכּוּחַ אַרְמִי, לְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּכֹחַ אֲשֻׁרִי וּבְכּוּחַ אַרְמִי
"first the Torah was given to Israel in the Hebrew writing and in the Holy Language (Hebrew); in the days of Ezra the Torah was given for the second time, in the Aramaic ("Assyrian") script and in the Aramaic language, they chose for Israel the Aramaic ("Assyrian") script and the Holy Language (Hebrew), and they left for common folk (generally seen as the Samaritans) the Hebrew script and the Aramaic language". This much-discussed passage is a problematic one, and not all of its enigmas were so far solved, but the awareness of the Sages to the

problems might be seen, cf. Naveh 1982, 123. However, the change of script in "the days of Ezra", i.e., under the Achæmenids, is a fact. From this quotation it may be seen that the transfer to the Aramaic script was gradual.

We have some indications that the transfer from the Paleo-Hebrew to the Aramaic "official" script began already in the Persian Period; thus, we have a seal where the Hebrew name of the female possessor and the word "daughter of" is written in the Hebrew script, while the Akkadian name of her father, one of those participating in the Repatriation Movement in the epoch of Cyrus/Darius, was written in Aramaic script⁷⁵.

Djakonov stressed that already in the Median period there were Aramaic speakers in Iran⁷⁶. Indeed, we have some important Aramaic texts from Iran, studied by Naveh 1965. A silver bowl carrying an Aramaic inscription from the 5th century BCE was found some time ago in Georgia, the so-called "Kazbegi treasure", Tsereteli 1994, 9. In Iran, Aramaic continued to be used long after it ceased to be used in the administration, as may be indicated by the fact that Aramaic loan words found their way into Iranian. One has to assume that scribes were trained in Aramaic and even in grammar and morphology and the fairly high level of standardization of Parthian and Middle Persian orthography attested by the inscriptions, as reflecting some continuous acquaintance with Aramaic, must be taken into account. Perhaps it was that ever-felt presence of Aramaic that facilitated the absorption of similar-sounding Arabic lexica into Persian after the Islamic conquest. It is worth noting that the Avestan alphabet used the Pahlavi, i.e., Aramaic, forms of letters and the direction of writing, thus indicating how deeply the Aramaeo-Pahlavi⁷⁷ script became associated with the Iranian national legacy.

Nevertheless, the early Sasanian kings still used Greek in their inscriptions, and the extraordinary feat of recording the Avesta was performed in a meticulously elaborate phonetical alphabet⁷⁸ based not only on Aramaic forms of letters, but also on a Greco-Bactrian (or, Byzantine?⁷⁹) principle of vowel letters. However, the histories and natures of the Avestan and Pahlavi scripts demonstrate that there were no parallel developments of Avestan and Pahlavi literary (i.e., written) traditions until a very late date.

75 For examples of that sort cf. Naveh 1982, 117-123.

76 As was said, even Darius was perhaps a speaker of some Aramaic; the first "Aramaic scribes" were invariably Aramaeans indeed, and they were those who introduced the cult of Nabû, the Mesopotamian Mercury, who became venerated as Tīrī, the god of scribes, an entirely non-Iranian craft; this item demonstrates what exactly could be the religion of those Aramaic scribes, cf. Boyce 1988.

77 As to the letters combinations of which composed the "Great Name" of the divinity of Mazda, according to Shahrastāni, they were rather Pahlavi, pace Shaki 1985, 541.

78 Avestan script "est le résultat d'une étude savante de la phonétique de la langue sacrée", Christensen 1944, 516.

79 "Iranian traditions" dispersed in Greece, India etc. were assembled under Šāhpūhr I, 241-272 CE, cf. Bailey 1943, 81ff, cf. also Zaehner 1955, 32-33; Crone 1991, 30, wrote on Byzantinizing tendencies under Kawād and Anōšūrwān, while written treatises were presented to the King by various religious communities, and some of these treatises were, perhaps, incorporated into texts from which Dēnkard's and Skand Gumānīg Wīzār's accounts on foreign religions were derived. It was the period when the Avestan alphabet was created, and it is not impossible that there was some connection between these two facts, the Byzantine impact and the creation of an alphabet so similar to Greek by its innermost nature.

We know that the Iranian kings held their treasures, including books and registers, in their palaces⁸⁰, as is clear from Esther 6.1. Thus, if an authoritative copy of the Avesta existed in Early Sasanian times, it should be most probably stored in a Sasanian palace, e.g., in the new capital of Ctesiphon⁸¹. However, it is true that we do not hear anything about any copy of Avesta kept in a royal palace, but in Ganj ī *Sabīgān, or in Diz ī Nibišt, or in Kōh ī Nibišt.

The text that identifies the place where a copy of the Avesta was kept as at Persepolis is a New Persian text of Ibn Balxī's Fārs-Nāmah 59-50, ed. Le Strange & Nicholson 1921, 49ff.; its tradition seems to be authentic, as it speaks of Zand and Kōh ī Nibišt, and a possible identification with Diz ī Nibišt, known from Pahlavi texts, was suggested:

čūn Zardušt biyāmad, Vištāsf ūrā ba 'ibtidā' qabūl na kard va bād az ān ūrā qabūl kard, va kitāb ī Zand āvurda būd, hama hikmat, va bar dūzdah hazār pūst ī gāv ī dābāyat karda nabišta būd az zarr. Va Vištāsf ānrā qabūl kard va ba ištahr ī Pārsī kūhē ast, Kōh ī Nibišt gūyand. Hama šūrathā va kandagarihā az sang ī xārā karda and va 'āšār ī 'ajīb andarōn namūda va īn kitāb ī Zand-u Pāzand ba ānjā nihāda būd.

80 Cf. Shaked 1994b, 100 n. 3. It is merely by accident that in Armenia, whose culture owes so much to its Iranian legacy, the famous *Matenadaran*, "the Storage of Texts", is one of the most important landmarks of Yerevan.

81 Whose Iranian name is rendered as Tizbon in Armenian, Taysafūn in Arabo-Persian, *Tezbōn/Dizbon in the Sasanian *Dari*. The city's Greek name is a result of a popular etymology, drawing on the Iranian sound of the name close to Greek words beginning with *kte-*, especially, *κτίζω*, "to build", cf. Russell 1990, 39 n. 29. As to the capital's Iranian name and its popular etymology, cf. Shahrastānīhā ī Eran 21-22 (cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 61-2): pat kōst ī Xarbarān šāhrestān ī Tēstfōn az īramān ī Tōs ī W/Gurāzag ī W/Gēbāgān kard, "the city of Tēstfōn in the direction of the West was built by command of Tōs son of W/Gurāzag son of W/Gēbāgān" (note the interchange *w/g* and *w/b* Barāzag / Garāzag / Varāza-). Tēstfōn here is explained as a popular etymology of Tōs (still Hamza al-īsfahānī was of this opinion, quoted in Markwart & Messina 1931, 61). Otherwise, Shahrastānīhā ī Eran names Ctesiphon *Āsūr* (Judæo-Persian texts identify Babylon as Baghdad, and *Āsūr* is rendered by them as *Mwš*!). Thus, it is tempting to suggest that the name of the Sasanian capital was actually *Diz-i Bun, "court-fort" (or, "the main fortress"?), or "camp" ("bunag)-fort", and it was identical with *Diz ī Sabīgān, known from the Dēnkard.

When Zoroaster appeared, Vishtaspa at first did not accept him, but after a while he did accept him. He (Zoroaster) brought a book of Zand, full of wisdom [or: the whole wisdom⁸²], written in gold on 12,000 bull skins. And Vishtaspa accepted it, and there is a mountain in Staxr of Persis, called *the Mountain of Writings*. All the images and carvings are made (there) of granite and marvelous monuments are shown (there), and he (Vishtaspa) placed there this book of Zand and pāzand⁸³.

It appears from the text that the locality owes its name of *the Mountain of Writings* (Kōh ī Nibišt) to the images and carvings (šūrathā va kandagarihā; inscriptions?), not to any written records kept there. The Achaemenid stone tower opposite the royal tombs at Naqš ī Rustam⁸⁴, with its carvings referred to as *šūrathā va kandagarihā ... va pādār ī 'ajlā*, near Persepolis was called *Bun-xānag*⁸⁵ by Kirdēr in his inscription [KKZ 4 & KNRm 7]. If there was in existence a written text of the Avesta in Sasanian times, there were merely few copies, may be only one⁸⁶, and the latter Middle Persian texts refer to the Avestan text as to *bun*, "original, basis, foundation". It seems that this usage is older than our extant Middle Persian renderings from Avestan, and it goes back to the one real copy. Scholars, combining these data⁸⁷, took the name of *Bun-xānag* as meaning "House of the original text of the Avesta". Henning considered *bun-xānag* as a designation of *Ka'ba-ye Zardušt* and inclined to identify it with *Diz ī Nibišt*, but it seems, with Humbach 1974, 204, that he was misled by Ibn Bal'xī's *Fārs-Nāmah*, identifying *Kōf ī Nibišt*, i.e., *Naqš ī Rustam*, with the so-called *Ka'ba-ye Zardušt*, i.e., *bun-xānag*, and both of them with *Diz ī Nibišt* of DkM 411.17ff. According to Shaki 1974, 334, Kirdēr's *bun-xānag* cannot be identical with *Ka'ba-ye Zardušt*.

82 Compare Pahlavi *harwisp. āgāh* Th.

83 A similar text in Arabic, but without mentioning carvings etc., is by Miskawayhi, translated and transcribed in Shaked 1994b, 76.

84 *Ka'ba-ye Zardušt* in Persepolis, near Naqš ī Rustam, is an Anahita shrine; Sāhpuhr ī inscription of 262 CE and Kirdēr's inscription were found there.

85 It is impossible to go here into all the problems connected with this term and with different interpretations.

86 The opinion of Awn I, projected anachronistically to the Achaemenian period, is that there was one single copy.

87 Henning 1957, Introduction [i]; Hinz 1961, 16; cf. Gignoux 1984a, 145 n. 5.

In [a'ālibī, ed. Zotenberg, 252, whose information corresponds the data of the *Ardaš[y]* *Wirāz*⁸⁸. *Nāmag* (AWN) 1.7, *Diz ī Nibišt* was situated in the *qal'eh*, "fortress", of *Ištār*, *Staxr ī Pābagān*. The tradition⁸⁹ took *Diz ī Nibišt* as "fort of written documents". The word *diz* in the same spelling as in the *Dēnkard* passages quoted below (**klyt**, **QRYT**) is found in also in *Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr ī Pābagān* (KNAP), applied to the serpent *Kirm's* fortress. Belardi 1979, 25⁹⁰, read the word in Awn 1.15 in Aramaic, *kellaitā / kallitā*, and one may suppose that the *diz* of the Writings was spelled by this Aramaeogram because there was a well-established tradition going back to the times when the Aramaic scribes were keeping the books, associating Aramaic and writing in general. Shahbazi 1986, 165-6, strengthened Henning's view by quoting the Persian (Bal'amī's) version of the chronicle of *Ṭabarī* (*Ṭā'rib*, 657, ed. de Goeje 1879):

Then *Guštāsp* placed this book (the Avesta) in his own treasure house, a house of stone (*xāna-ē az sang*), and appointed custodians for it; and he did not give copies of it to the common people, but only to the most privileged, and nowadays [i.e., 10th century] it is not accessible to all magi, and those who possess it, possess it in an incomplete form.

Shahbazi supposes that the original text of *Bal'amī* should be emended to read **bun-xāna-ē az sang*⁹¹. However, *Bal'amī*'s text, though frequently providing valuable information not found elsewhere, is not supported here by the *Ṭabarī*'s Arabic original. The Zoroastrian Middle Persian versions of the same story do not mention the surroundings of Persepolis; the only exception is the Awn 1.1-15⁹², which placed the location where the Avesta was kept in *Staxr*:

ud ēn dēn clyōn hamāg Abistāg ud Zand [ī] abar gāw-pōstThā ī *Wirāstāg*
ud pad āb ī zarr nibištāg andar *Staxr ī Pābagān* pad *diz* [ī] nibišt nihād
ēstād awē pidyārag ī wad-baxt ī ahlāmōg ī druwand ī anāgkardār [ī]
Alaksandar ī hrōmāyīg ī mušrāyīg mānišn abar āwurd ud bē sōxt.

88 de Menasce 1949, 3ff., still maintained the reading *Wirāf*.

89 Cf. West & Haug 1874, XI.

90 For discussion, cf. Vahman 1986, 225ff.

91 Shahbazi also notes that the name *Ka'ba-ye-Zardušt* is relatively new, and was accepted under the influence of European travellers.

92 Bailey 1943, 151-2; Gignoux 1984a, 37ff., translated on p.145ff.; Vahman 1986, 76-79, translated on p.191, notes pp.223ff. Cf. also *Tansar-Nāme*, ed. Minovi, 140-1; Bianchi 1977, 3-30.

And these "Religious Writings", namely all of the Avesta and the Zand which had been written with gold water on prepared oxen hide and deposited in Staxr ī Pābagān in the Fortress of Writings, that wicked, wretched, heretic, sinful, maleficent Alexander the Roman, resident of Egypt, took away and burnt⁹³.

The version of Dk 5.3⁹⁴ is different:

4. ud ristag-kunišn nišānīhā andar āwām āwām ō paydāgīh madan rasīd ēd cē Jāmāsp az hān ī Zardu[x]št hammōg bē guft ud hast ī nibišt jomāy Abistāg ud Zand ī pad gāw-pōst *dānāgīhā <pad> zarr nibišt ēstād <ud>pad Ganj ī xwadāyān dāšt.

5. dehbedān ud dastwarān azaš būd ī wēš paccēn kard pasaz ō-z āgāhān ud wināh-jādārānāz azaš hast ī mad būd ī jud-dādistānīh jud-wēnišnīh abar burd.

4. The signs of the making of heretical movements came to manifestation, in different periods. The reason for this is that Jamasp preached some of the teachings of Zoroaster, and some of them he wrote down, viz., the Avesta and the Zand jointly, on oxen-hides. He wrote them down in wisdom in gold [letters] and kept in the Royal Treasury.

5. There were among the rulers and the authorities some who made several copies, and of those there were some that reached the savants and the wrong-doers as well, and [the latter] turned them over to false opinions and false views.

The text is a bit corrupt here. It is impossible that the "savants" brought "false opinions", so, it must be supposed that the original text read something like: "both the savants *brought *right *opinions and *right *views and the wrong-doers brought false opinions and false views". However, what is stated is that wrong opinions derive from the Zand, widely disseminated⁹⁵ from the copy held in the Royal Treasury. What is interesting about this text is that it states that

⁹³ Translation of Vahman used, with some slight changes.

⁹⁴ DkD 431, cf. West 1892, xxxi, West 1897, 126-7, Bailey 1943, 217 (& 154), Molé 1967, 112-113. The reading and translation presented here are by Sh. Shaked, with some slight changes.

⁹⁵ The wide dissemination of copies of the Avesta noted by Bailey 1943, 164, in DkM 406.9, was ascribed to Ardashir.

Zoroaster's teachings were oral, that Jāmāsp put some of them, but not all, in writing; the composition of the Zand is attributed to Zoroaster himself quite frequently. Later, copies were made, and some people made inappropriate use of these copies; clearly the ZandTgs are meant.

In some way, it was, then, Jāmāsp who was responsible for the misuse made of the prophet teachings. And indeed, we have another, Manichaean, tradition that attributes the corruption of Zoroaster's teachings to Jāmāsp. In this Manichaean Zand⁹⁶, the greater pious men of the religions of Revelation are described as vicious sinners: the murderous Devadatta joined by King Aśoka, the name of Jāmāsp is coupled with that Alexander as destroyers of Zoroaster's faith. It is plausible to suggest that this Manichaean Zand was based on the same tradition about Jāmāsp as, perhaps the first, codicator of the Avesta.

Another version is found in Dk 7.7:3⁹⁷:

pasaz az wišōbišn ī az Alaksandar mad was hān ī xwadāyān ī az hān pas az pargandagīh abāz ō hamīh āwurd, hast ī pad ganj ī *Sasabīgān dāštan framūd.

Even after the havoc which happened because of Alexander, those who were rulers⁹⁸ after him collected some of it (the Avesta) from the scattered state and ordered to keep it in the Sasabīgān⁹⁹ Treasury.

Here we have a reference to the assembling the dispersed Avesta anew; this topos was studied in Pines 1990. The version of DkM 411ff. (cf. Nyberg 1964, 108:8ff.), cf. West & Haug 1874, 3-5, West 1892, 413, Bailey 1943, 218, Shaki 1981, Shaked 1994b, 99-101, is as follows: ...Dāray ī Dārayān hamāg Abistāg ud Zand ciyōn Zardu[x]št az Ohrmazd padgrift nibištāg 2 paccēn ēwag pad Ganj ī Sabīgān ēwag pad diz ī nibišt dāštan framūd. ... [Sāhpuhr] abāz ō ham āwurd ud abāg Abistāg abāz

⁹⁶ Cf. Henning 1944, 133-144 = Henning 1977, 139-150.

⁹⁷ Cf. West 1897, 82, Molé 1967, 71-2.

⁹⁸ These "rulers" were rather the Arsacids; compare West 1897, 82 n.1.

⁹⁹ *Sasabīgān, Bailey 1942, 230-1; Saptkān, Stītkān, Markwart 1931, 108; Sēčtkān, Nyberg 1974, 186. Cf. below.

handāxt ud harw hān ī drust paccēn ō hān Ganj ī Sabīgān 100 dād.

¹⁰⁰ This word (cf. also DkM 405.19; 406.1, 9; 412.4, 22; 437.20; 649.19; AWN 1.18) was read and translated in a variety of ways. Markwart 1901, 108-9, identified *ganj* in *ganj ī x^vadāyān* (cf. now DkM 341.20f.; it seems that the form *šāhīgān* was influenced by that of the name of *Sēz*, and corrupted because this name was unknown, being a mask for another place. That is the reason why it was substituted by the synonymous *Ganj ī x^vadāyān*) with *Ganjak* i.e., with *Cēs* [Arabic al-Sīz] >

šīzīgān; on *Ganj ī x^vadāyān*, "the treasure of the rulers", cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 108-10; it is worth notice that in *Sēz* near Ganzak, where the *Adur Gušnāsp* Fire was situated, there was "a Magi school, the antecedent and nurisher of the whole of the Magism, called *Sīrōš* of the Magi", Vita Mar Abae, Bedjan 1895, Pigulevskaja, "Mar Aba I", 79. *Sīz* (the form *Sīz* will be used for convenience), modern *Taxt ī Sulaimān*, on location and reading, cf. Marquart 1901, 108-9; Bailey 1943, 230; Bailey 1971, XLII-XLIII; *Sīz Cēs* < **Cēst* *Sīz* may be from *Cēšast* (*Cēs* < **Cēst*), cf. Minorsky 1943/6, 256; 264. However, Shaki 1981, 115 n.1, rightly showed that the Middle Persian form of the name of the lake Caecasta is *Cēcast*, GrBd 10.1, which may have been contracted to **Cēš* or *Cēs*, as in the Arabic name of the place, *Jīs*, not *Sēš* or *Sīz*, which is the Arabized form. Bailey 1943, 155 n. 3, has *šasapīkān*. The term occurs also in the opening of *Ayādgār ī Wuzurg-mīhr* [PT 85], where West 1887, 263-4, rendered it as "Moi, **Wuzurg-mīhr*, fils de Bōkhtak, président du conseil privé et ministre de l'intérieur du pays du fidèle Khūsrō, préparai et déposai dans la trésorie royale (*ganj-ī shahikān*) ce mémoire..."; Bailey 1971, xlii-xliii: *abyādgār ī Wuzurg-mīhr ī Bōxtagān zanīnbed šabistān-šahr* [ī] *ostīgān xusraw-darīgbed*, "the memorial of WMB, keeper of the women, *trusted of the state* ?17, chief of Xusraw's court, was held in the *ganj ī šāhīgān*"; Cunakova 1991, 49, rendered it as follows: *man Wuzurgmīhr ī Bōxtagān winārbed* [ī] *šabestān šahr ī ostīgān Xusraw darīgbed en ayādgār ... pad ganj ī šāhīgān nihād*. The word *šabestān* was dealt with in Henning 1958, 45, and in Shaked 1969, 184 ("eunuch"); the whole title translated and dealt with in Brunner 1978, 46, Shaked 1982a, 299-303 [*wēnān.pad.tan.šabestān*], Lukonin 1987, 245 n. 81. As to *Ganj ī šāhīgān*, "*šāhīgān*" alone was translated by Cunakova 1991, in her Glossary, as "дворец", palace. It is now to be noted that the word *šabistān* occurs as *AZ-dahāg's* title; in *Sahrestānīhād ī Erān* §§18 & 49 we find: *AZ-dahāg ped ī šabistān* calling *AZ-dahāg* a *ped ī šabistān* may imply that his *harem* activities are meant, known from Yašt 5.34. Kasumova 1978, Kasumova 1994, 57, 63, 78-9, rendered *pid ī šabistān* as "властелин Тьмы", "the Prince of Darkness". In both Middle and New Persian *šibist/šibīst* means "monster" etc.; the myth of *Kirm* as told in *KNAP* and in the *Sāh-Nāmāh* was strengthened by the affinity in sound of *šibist/šibīst*, "monster", and *šabistān*, "harem", "eunuch". As to the word *zanīnbed*, used in the WMB passage, *šōmēr hannāšīm*, "the keeper of women" in the Hebrew of Esther may be a wrong analysis of **zanīnpat* as if **zanīnpāt*. The reading adopted here is that by Shaked 1994b, 100 n. 3: "the treasury of the (royal) quarters". Shaked rightly alludes to Esther 6.1.

¹⁰¹ Oarius, son of Darius, commanded that the whole Avesta and Zand as received by Zoroaster from Ahura Mazda - two copies of (that) writing to be preserved, one in the *Sabīgān Treasury* and one in the *Fortress of Writings*. ... (*Sāhpuhr*) collected them¹⁰² and caused them to fit the Avesta and every correct copy he ordered to be deposited the in the **Sabīgān Treasury*.

This is the only version that mentions both **Sabīgān Treasury* (the *Royal Quarters*, the *Palace*?) and the *Fortress of Writings* as the places where two copies of the whole Avesta and Zand were kept. Previously, the *Dēnkard* account (DkM 406, cf. West 1892, xxxi, Bailey 1943, 217) stated:

σ sōzišn ī hān ī pad Ganj ī **Sabīgān* ō dast ī Hrōmāyān mad ūš awiz Yūnanīg uzwān wizārd,

*After it that is in the **Sabīgān Treasury* (i.e., the Avesta) was burnt down and fell into the hands of the Romans, it was translated into the Greek language¹⁰³.

The act of burning the Avesta is here anachronistically ascribed to the Byzantines, confused with the Greco-Macedonian armies. One can hardly imagine how a text, having been burnt, could be *after that* translated into any language. Two traditions are combined here: that of burning the Avesta by Alexander, as represented in AWN 1, and that of the Avesta dispersed amongst the nations¹⁰⁴. But it is possible to speculate here that this first tradition refers to a well-known historical fact, the pillage of *Sīz*, with its treasures, by the armies of Heracleus in 617 CE¹⁰⁵. It appears from these passages that at least one written copy of the Avesta existed in Sasanian times; however, there is a big discrepancy as to the site where the Avesta actually was kept.

¹⁰¹ The translation used here is that of Shaked 1994b, 99-100, with slight changes.

¹⁰² All kinds of knowledge collected, *inter alia*, from Byzantium and India.

¹⁰³ According to Tabari, 700, cf. Perelman 1987, 93, the Persian learnings on the sciences, etc., were translated, after Alexander, into *Aramaic*, and then into Greek.

¹⁰⁴ Again, cf. Pines 1990.

¹⁰⁵ It is possible that the spelling forms similar so much to the name of *Sīz* are actually a late combination of **Ganj ī Sabīgān* with the name of *Sīz*. It seems that a copy of Avesta was indeed

kept and studied in this ancient city of priests; Arabic sources mention "*Ayādgār al-Furs*" (which must be Avesta [with its Zand?], as the term *ayādgār* was used for "Avesta", cf. DkM 412.11) studied at the "Gypsum Castle", *Qal'at al-Juṣṣ* < **Diz ī Sīz*.

There is another text, *SahrestānThā ī Erān*, §2ff. (cf. Bailey 1943, 153), which states:

pas Zardu(x)št dēn āwurd az framān <T> Wištāsp šāh 1,200 fragard pad dēn-dibīrīh pad taxtagīhā¹⁰⁶ <T> zarrēn kand ud nibīšt ud pad ganj <T> hān āta(x)š nihād. ud pas gizastag Skandar sōxt ud andar ō drayāb abgand.

Then Zoroaster brought the Religion / the Avesta and by the order of the king Vishtaspa 1,200 fragards were engraved and written on golden tablets in the religious script¹⁰⁷ and placed in the treasury of that (the Bahrām Fire of Samarkand) fire. Afterwards, the accursed Alexander burnt it and threw into the sea.

This account is different: golden tablets instead of 1,200 / 12,000 oxen hides inscribed in gold; Samarkand instead of Sīz, no mention of Zand, only the "Religion", i.e., the Avestan original text, written in "religious script". This tradition seems to be unconnected to those of Awn and the Dēnkard¹⁰⁸.

All this may be summed up as follows: according to the Zoroastrian Middle Persian evidence, there were copies of the Avesta in existence; the traditions about the Avesta and Zand deposited at Staxr, Persepolis or Sīz are unreliable; a copy of the Avesta was kept rather at the royal palace¹⁰⁹, in all the probability, in Ctesiphon.

106 Bailey 1943, 151, rightly made here a reference to the 'alwāh of Bahā'ullāh as a parallel.

107 In the Avestan alphabet, cf. Tafazzoli 1993.

108 However, it is worth noting that, as far as I know, only this particular composition, *SahrestānThā ī Erān*, knows Ctesiphon, named there simply Asūr, "Assur". In passing, it is worth notice that in Judaeo-Persian sources Asūr means "Mosul".

109 Cf. note 100, in the end.

For a better understanding of the Sasanian literary situation, some comments should be made concerning the meaning of the word "Avesta". The word *Avesta* was explained in a variety of ways: from "praise", *upa-stāvaka- (Bartholomae); from "basis", *upa-sta- (Geldner and Andreas); from "knowledge", *vid- (i.e., close in meaning to *Verb*, according to Dhalla 1963¹¹⁰). Bailey¹¹¹ has explained the term as *Apastāka, "Book of Commandments", or the "Book of Praise" (*upa-stau; the term is still retained in Ormurī word for "reading", *abišta); Bailey 1985a, 11-2, takes the first element as from apa, "separated, distinguished", an adjectival form, not as a preverb. According to this view, the Middle Persian *pst'k was transmitted in the "Southern dialect", and st'k represents *stā-avāka-, the same root as in Hittite ištūwa-, "to declare solemnly", or in Greek στενωται, "to speak boastingly" [Middle Voice].

Middle Persian forms are *pst'k, *pst'kyk and *pyst'k, *pyst'k¹¹²; Pāzand has avastā or āvastā, ¹¹³; Parsi Sanskrit has avistā, and Abū Nuwās¹¹⁴ used Bistāq for "Avesta". Sometimes the word for "Avesta" was compared to a Middle Persian word found in expressions well-attested on seals¹¹⁵, *pst'n <L yzd'n, abāstān/m ō yazdān, "reliance on the gods"¹¹⁶. The original Avestan text of Pahlavi *Zand* texts is frequently referred to as bun¹¹⁷, "basis, origin", this analogy enabling to strengthen the etymology suggested by Geldner and Andreas; DkM 786.11-12 defines the prayer *Ahunvar* as "the seed of the sources of the Religion", tōhmagān tōhmag ī Dēn, which is close to bun. Another Pahlavi term for the Avestan text is dēn, "religion". As is well known, dēn, "religion", is frequently used in the sense of "Avestan text" or even "texts based on the Avesta proper and as reliable as the Avesta itself".

110 Cf. also Belardi 1979. For a good review of opinions, cf. Gikyd Itō 1974.

111 Bailey, H.W., *The Orbit of Afghan studies, A Lecture Given at the Society's (the Society for Afghan Studies) Inaugural Meeting*, p.1 [no date].

112 The final -k may represent the original adjective ending; another possibility is that this -k was an orthographic device to render the long final -ā.

113 Syriac, Armenian, Arabic and New Persian forms are given in Bailey 1985a, 9.

114 Cf. Capezone 1989, 91.

115 E.g., Provasi 1975, 429, 433; Kirste 1888, *passim*.

116 Cf. also Benfey 1858, 676.

117 There is some semantic analogy between the name of the Avesta and its language, Avestan, and the name of the Pāli language [absent from the Canon, appearing in the commentary literature], originally "text", hence "sacred text", hence "the language of the sacred text", unlike "the language of the commentary"; cf. Jelizarenkova & Toporov 1965, 7.

This could be seen from the formula "pad dēn paydāg kū", etc., introducing Avestan quotations¹¹⁸, "Avesta" and dēn being thus synonyms. On this basis, it is plausible to suggest the possibility that "Avesta" means actually not only "the Avestan text", but also "religion", exactly the way dēn means "Avesta"¹¹⁹. The meanings "religion", "Avesta" of the word dēn may have perhaps developed from slightly different sources than being merely a continuation of the Avestan daēnā-¹²⁰. We know that the Iranian word dēn, "religion", was borrowed in the Achaemenian period into Aramaic where it underwent the process of contamination with the genuine word for "judgment, justice", Aramaic dīn.

But previously to that the Iranian dēn / daēnā- was, as I suggest, influenced by Akkadian dinnum / dīn^{um}, "document, contract; strength, basis", dannit^{um}, "document", Aramaic¹²¹ dinnat-, "written text, document"¹²², from the root DNN, "to be strong, to strengthen". The word occurs also in the Akkadian-Aramaic formula dnt zy [Whwbrz], used on a newly discovered coin¹²³. This highly tentative suggestion of a contaminated etymology presupposes the existence of a text recorded in writing.

On the other hand, the Iranian dēn / daēnā- poses several etymological and semantical problems on the Iranian part, too. The Avestan word daēnā- is difficult to translate. Bartholomae (AIW 662b), e.g., simply rendered it "Religion", after the face value of the Pahlavi usage of dēn.

118 Among formulas that are characteristic for quoting Avesta, thus introducing the Zand, are also kū, ay, hēd, as well as az dēn paydāg, bun, gyāg ē paydāg, etc.

119 For this reason, I frequently translated Pahlavi dēn as "Avesta".

120 In the 9th century, Afšīn (Tavadia quoted in Sundermann 1992, 170 n. 46) named Zoroastrianism "al-dīn al-abyaq", "the white religion" (no doubt, *dēn ī spēdag). Though the context there is different, as was noted by Sundermann, this designation clearly reflected the old identification of the "beautiful (or, "shining", "spēdag) girl", daēnā, with the goal of pious life, "religion".

121 CIS 17; DISO 59.

122 The word was widely used by Achaemenian and Arsacid scribes. The root is perhaps attested once in Hebrew: Genesis 6.3 [לֹא יִדְוֹן רוּחַ בָּאָדָם]; the Hebrew for "Religion" (actually, "Faith"), אֱמוּנָה, derived from a root semantically identical with the Akkadian DNN (compare Exodus 17.12, אֱמוּנָה).

123 "Contract of Oborzos", cf. Bivar 1994, 66; Bivar 1996, 37-38, prefers to see here Mithraic overtones. The later Semitic word for "Law" in the sense of "Religion" is due to a contamination of Akkadian dinn^{um}, dīn^{um}, "strength, basis", Aramaic dīn, "court, judgement, justice" and Iranian daēnā-.

In some sense, his interpretation was thus not different from that of the Sasanian Zandists, who had a clear tendency to identify their own concepts with those of the Avestan language, using Pahlavi etymons of Avestan words (it seems that they were not always aware of the semantical gap). Etymologically, however, daēnā- could very well belong to the root of Persian dīdan "to see", so that one might regard a man's daēnā- as a kind of Platonic idea of one in the other world, his soul-prototype¹²⁴. The word daēnā- itself may signify "vision, conception" and thus it continues the value of its underlying stative root dī- "view, consider", with which it is employed etymologically at Y 44.10bd: tam daēnam...daīdyat¹²⁵ "have they seen that vision?"¹²⁶.

Every man (and woman?) has his daēnā-, a representation of his own virtues (kīrbag, in Pahlavi) - or misdeeds. If the man was kīrbag.kār, "a pious one" in Pahlavi, his daēnā- meets him on the Bridge of Separation, after his death, in the image of a beautiful young woman, and if he was not - in the image of an ugly old woman, or a whore¹²⁷; compare, e.g., MX¹²⁸ (and elsewhere) hān ī x^vēš nēwag kunišn pad kanīg kīrb, "his own good deeds in form of a girl"... hēm nē kanīg bē kunišn ī nēwag ī tō, "I am not a girl, but your good deeds", etc.

Most religions, among them Zoroastrianism, are based on the idea of a good reward for good deeds and punishment for sins; the Zoroastrian tradition is especially preoccupied with personal eschatology, the reward received in the afterlife. As the impetus of Zoroastrianism is to perform good deeds for the sake of one's own soul¹²⁹, the word daēnā- / dēn, frequently glossed kunišn, "[good] deed, merit, operandum"¹³⁰, referring to reward and obligation, developed in

124 With the word "idea" also belonging to a base meaning "to see", *vid-, cf. Gershevitch 1980b, 285.

125 Translated "standardly", ēn dēn ... dahēd, where the Zandist mistook the verb of seeing for the verb of giving.

126 Cf. Insler 1975, 192 (Nyberg quoted).

127 Cf., e.g., Vahman 1983, Calmeyer & Gaube 1985, Widengren 1983c, Sundermann 1992.

128 Quoted in Sundermann 1992, 163.

129 On the term, cf. Shaked 1990c.

130 There was perhaps a stage when daēnā- was identical with kīrbag, understood, on the level of popular etymology, as "what is done by a person", but also "what should be done". However, kīrbag is a continuation of the same lemma as the Avestan kōhrp-, "form", and that makes kīrbag semantically identical to daēnā-, which also means "(visible) form", cf. Gershevitch 1980a and 1980b. It seems that not only the Arabic dīn, "religion, law", but the Arabic daīn, "debt, obligation; financial claim" as well, are loans from Iranian (in quite a number of languages, including English, "debt" and "duty", both of which are from *debere*, are synonymous). If it is so, then this second word, daīn, was used as synonymous with kīrbag, "meritorious deed, merit", and indeed, attention was called to somewhat reversible use of

dērv/kīrbagin Iranian popular religion (Vahman 1983).

Middle Iranian the new sense of "religion", "religious community" and even "the sacred texts of this religion"¹³¹.

A particular revelation given to a particular person, Zoroaster, became the Holy Word, *Spənta- Məθra-*, for the humanity. Zoroaster held, of course, in very high esteem the Hymns revealed to him by Lord Wisdom, but it is plausible to suggest that it was only a long time after the prophet that the connotation of "sacred text" was developed. In Pahlavi, *dēn* means "religion", "Avesta", and it is the word used by the formalistic-minded *Zandists* to translate the Avestan for "revelation, vision". This type of translation I call the "standard", or "formal" translation, when a fixed [Pahlavi] word should cover all the meanings of a given [Avestan] word in the original text¹³². Derived from the root with meaning "to see", *dēn* may have been translated even "vision" or "revelation", referring not only to Zoroaster's own *daēnā-*, but also to the whole of information revealed to him. On this basis of uninterrupted, until the latest stages of the Pahlavi literature, usage of the word *dēn* for things seen as revealed to Zoroaster, I suggest that the term **Abistāg* (not attested in the Avesta itself) was coined later than *dēn*, as a gloss to *dēn*¹³³. In my opinion, **Abistāg* translating *dēn* derives from **vid-*, "to see" (synonymous with *dī-* and suppletive to it, cf. Persian *dīdan* / *bī[n]*), and meant "things shown, revelation", being later partly contaminated with **pst'n* found on seals. Regarding the phonetic form of Avestan *daēnā-*, it was itself influenced by the Sasanian pronunciation, **dayanā* > *daēnā-* < *dēn* (cf. Insler 1975, 192), being a reworking of Middle Iranian *dēn* into the redaction of the text¹³⁴. That is, the Middle Iranian word was read-in into the Avestan texts during the period of oral transmission, and the Sasanian *Zand* tradition, which identifies *dēn* with **dayanā* > *daēnā-*, follows thus the older custom. Concerning Bailey's etymology, it may be a good example of how the word was understood by Iranians later.

¹³¹ Cf. Sundermann 1992, 165.

¹³² AIW and the vocabulary in Dhabhar 1927 generally provide such "standard" renderings; cf. also the illuminating remark in Kreyenbroek 1985, 76 n.1.8, who noted that *tarsagāh*, "devout, reverent", was "regularly used to render" Avestan *as̥t*, "recompense".

¹³³ Which about that time, under the Akkadian/Aramaic impact, has developed an additional sense of "basis, document". It is probably more than a coincidence that both *dnt* and **pst'n* are found on seals.

¹³⁴ This observation seems to me important as it eliminates phonetic problems involved in the tentative contamination with Aramaic *dīn*.

As to the Ormuri word for "reading", it seems to be derived secondarily from the name of the Zoroastrian Holy Book, as it must be impossible that this meaning goes back to the epoch of pre-Zoroastrian, completely oral, paganism. This example demonstrates, I believe, the differences between the Avestan, especially the Gāthic, and the Sasanian theological perceptions, as etymologically related words, in many cases, have different range of meanings in Avestan and Pahlavi.

Zand

Now, some observations should be made concerning the meaning of the terms *Zand* and *Zandīk(g)*. Basically, the term *Zand* applies to the Zoroastrian Middle Persian, or Book Pahlavi, version of the Avestan texts. Nevertheless, this varied genre of writings is by no means a unitary corpus. The vast dispersed material which could be put under the category of *Zand* was never organized as a body of texts. It contains material dating from different epochs and originating, perhaps, from different schools of exegesis.

A sacral text is not complete without an additional interpretation¹³⁵. The need to interpret the "scriptures" which may have been transmitted orally, brought to life during the Sasanian period this package of text-cum-exegesis known as "Avesta-and-Zand", or "Zand-Avesta". In Western scholarship, the term *Zend-Avesta* was coined, following Oriental, but not specifically Zoroastrian models, as learning the Avesta meant basically studying the *Zand* of the Avesta.

Zand is a Parthian term, originally applied, according to Widengren¹³⁶, to the gnomic *Andarz* genre. The word seems to denote, originally, merely "knowledge", thus implying the purpose for which these explanatory comments were made, namely, to better the comprehension of the divine word, in its ancient and dead tongue, that was no longer understood.

The terms "translation" and "exegesis" do not fully render what the *Zand* really is. It was Schaefer 1930, 76, who identified the *Zand* as the Middle Persian *Targum* to the Avestan "text", and Gignoux 1986a, 56, defined *Zand* as exegesis like that of the Judaeo-Christian world¹³⁷; indeed, the Jewish *Targum* is the best parallel to the Zoroastrian *Zand*. The most important common notion about both Jewish *Targumim* and Zoroastrian *Zands* is that both were originally supposed to be, on the one hand, strictly oral and literal, and, on the other, they were fluid, non-fixed, open to re-working.

¹³⁵ Cf. Wansbrough 1977, 100, 148-170, on the Koranic material.

¹³⁶ Cf., e.g., Widengren 1960, 40 n.136.

¹³⁷ With references [ib., n.14] to definitions made by Mary Boyce.

As with the *Targumim*, there are different types of *Zands* as well. There are word-by-word *Targumim*, like the *Targum Onqelos* ("Aquila"), and there are midrashic *Targumim*, like that attributed to Jonathan ben Uzai (Targum Yonafan, or "Pseudo-Jonathan") and others (the "Fragmental" *Targum*, *Targum Neophiti*, etc.). All of them have their parallels in the extant *Zands*.

The basic difference is that while our extant *Targumim* are now strictly standardized and fixed¹³⁸, with little new material being added at the later stages of fixation, the Zoroastrian *Zands* represent an earlier stage in development: they have a more fluid character, and contain two features not found entirely in the Jewish *Targumim*: first, they use quotations in names of different sages, like "NN said that ..., but NN said that ...", or "but some say", found in Jewish writings in other genres of commentary literature, namely in the Mishnah and Gemara, but not in the *Targum*; second, the *Zands* frequently possess, in addition to the word-by-word translation and midrashic material, also more than one set of glosses¹³⁹.

These two features are often inter-connected, and one of the tasks of the modern editors of the *Zands* was to discriminate between the "translation" proper and the sets of glosses (in transliteration and translation, the glosses are put in the square brackets: []).

Though all the Zoroastrian *Zands* we possess now are in Zoroastrian Middle Persian, there is no reason why there should not be translations of Avestan texts into Parthian, or "Arsacid" Middle Persian, or any other language; after all, we possess traces of such translations into different Iranian tongues. *Zands* were known in several Iranian languages, including Old Sogdian (Gershevitch 1976a), Middle Sogdian, Bactrian, Parthian, Median, Old Persian (Skjærvø 1998), Armenian (Russell 1985-6, 7), as local versions of Avestan texts. The Avestan elements are most prominent in the Sogdian Manichaean texts, amongst all other remnants of Manichaean literature, since these come from the general area where the Avesta itself originally came from (Skjærvø 1998).

¹³⁸ They were written down and finally fixed as early as the Byzantine epoch, i.e., much earlier than the Zoroastrian *Zands* we possess now. The first Jewish prints, from the 16th century, included *Targumim*, and since then only minor changes, if any, have been introduced into their texts. In contrast, it was only in the New Time that the *Zands* were printed.

¹³⁹ However, it was observed that the way of glossization in Pahlavi texts is by no means different from that of the much later oldest Judæo-Persian Pentateuch of London, edited in Paper 1972.

Sundermann made known a Manichaean Middle Parthian fragment where Ahunwait Gāh Nask, i.e., the Ahunavaiti Gāthā, the first of the 50 Old Avestan Gathas, which begins with the *Ahuna Vairiia* prayer, is mentioned, while a Sogdian transcription of an Avestan text, the *Ašəm Vohū* prayer, a real Avestan text in Sogdian characters and in Sogdian pronunciation, was made known by Gershevitch 1976a¹⁴⁰. Another Sogdian *Zand* might be seen in 𐬰𐬭𐬀 𐬰𐬱𐬀𐬀 𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬀 𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 (axu əspatē artāw Zrušč), "the perfect righteous Zaruštra", standing for Avestan ašauua Zaruštra Spitāmō, (Skjærvø 1998), where Spitāma- is rendered as əspatē, "perfect". As to the Old Sogdian *Zands*, it was stated that the pieces we possess are sort of a linguistic upgrading or adaptation, of the same kind which we meet later in the Zoroastrian Pahlavi *Zands*.

Henning¹⁴¹ published a Manichaean "*Zand*"¹⁴² in which the greater pious men of the religions of Revelation are described as vicious sinners. The murderous Devadatta is joined there by King Aśoka, the great promulgator of Buddhism, and the name of the venerable in the Fravardīn Yašt Zāmašp is coupled with that of the accursed Alexander.

In light of such a great spread of the teachings of Zoroaster, one may ask whether some of the Greek (and other Western) books circulating under the name of Zoroaster, were not indeed some sort of *Zand*?

Moreover, some Middle Iranian pieces of exegesis to Avestan texts (which could be well defined as "*Zands*") were "translated"¹⁴³ back into Late Avestan, as the Late Avestan¹⁴⁴ term *zanda* indicates. Thus, Y 61.3 and Vd 18.55 imply, according to Schaeder 1930, 88-9, that sometimes Avestan texts go back to a Middle Persian *Vorlage*, thus giving us some chronological data for establishing the epoch in which *Zand* emerged. Avestan *zanda* yātdmanta, with variants, in

¹⁴⁰ The Sogdianized Avestan in the Sogdian fragment republished by Gershevitch is older than even the "Ancient Letters", dating from an epoch prior to Mani, meaning that this small but important part of the Zoroastrian canon was known in Sogdiana before the Sasanian period.

¹⁴¹ Henning 1944, 133-144 = Henning 1977, 139-150.

¹⁴² The term is used here in the negative Zoroastrian sense of the word, i.e., as a deformation of the original meaning of the sacred text. No doubt, such *Zands* were among the texts that enraged Zoroastrian priests and caused them to call Mani a *zandīk*, using the word as a term of abuse.

¹⁴³ The word "translated" used here does not necessarily imply that a certain text, written down or oral, was really translated, but rather that a Middle Iranian-thinking author believed that he is composing in Avestan. This sort of writing is somewhat similar to the "translation complex" known in connection with the Latin of medieval European sources, or Hebrew written in Europe and elsewhere.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. AIW 1662.

Vd 18.55, is clearly from Middle Iranian¹⁴⁵, and so is *zandamca yātumatamca*, in Y 61.3, too (where *zanda* is glossed over in Pahlavi as "the prophet of wizards"¹⁴⁶, *paygāmbar ī jādūgān*).

Nevertheless, very few extant pieces of *Zand* could be traced, unfortunately, to the Arsacid period. The Middle Persian Zoroastrian tradition preserves mention of a codification of the Avesta, apparently, with its *Zand*, under a certain Arsacid king Vologeses, and I think we should take this evidence on its face value: a Middle Iranian version, whether Parthian or Middle Persian¹⁴⁷, of some Avestan texts was in existence prior to the rise of the Sasanians. I see no reason to doubt that "Sasanian" *Zandist* traditions continued, in many aspects, "Arsacid" *Zandist* traditions¹⁴⁸.

Although sometimes it was stated that the Middle Persian versions were made only in the Sasanian period, which would account for the lack of comprehension of many words and passages on the part of the translator, but "the fact of matter is that the Pahlavi translations are astonishingly faithful to the Avestan ... and we must conclude that the Pahlavi version was based upon a long tradition of contemporary versions of the holy texts" (Skjærvø 1998).

According to this scholar, the Kirdēr's quotations were taken from a complete Middle Persian version of the Avesta extant at that time, even in a written form. This view should be strengthened by Mani's statement on the existence of books written by Zoroastrians, which books were, though, different from Zoroaster's own teachings; thus, one should see in these books *Zands* rather than the Avesta proper. It seems to me highly unlikely to expect Mani to state that the venerated - and incomprehensible - Avesta should not be Zoroaster's own words. When Mani said Zoroaster's pupils fabricated books, he clearly meant books in vernaculars (*i.e.*, the *Zands*), not the Avesta.

145 As **zant*!-, with *z*, is expected in Avesta. Cmp. as well *yātūmand* < *yātūk* > *jādūg*, cf. Schaefer 1930, 88. Avestan *zanda* occurs with *yātūmant*, "sorcerer", Y 61.3; Vd 18.55 (*pad zand jādūgīh*), *Frahang* 101m 20: *zinda yātūmantā*, *zand yātūk*. Cf. MX 35.16-7: *ud 13om kē zandīgīh kunēd ud 14om kē jādūgīh kunēd*.

146 According to Bailey 1963, 81, the meaning "sectary" of *zandīgīh* may have been developed from "sorcerer".

147 Skjærvø believes that all the extant Middle Persian versions go back to the 3rd century versions, because it seems that it was only then that the Middle Persian dialect was put in writing.

148 Cf. Chapter III.III "Mani and Zand", n. 1.

How could the Avesta in its original language be brought as an argument in a religious dispute, if neither Mani, nor the arbiter[s] (say, the King), and, probably, nor even Kirdēr (or other high-ranking Magian politician) could understand the contents of it without a vernacular version?¹⁴⁹ Mani could easily pretend to understand Avestan better than, say, Kirdēr. After all, Mani claimed he grasped what Zoroaster actually taught better than the Magi do.

There are some reasons to believe that some of those *Zands* which Mani disapproved, were composed only in his own lifetime, as parts of anti-Manichæan propaganda, while others had a longer history and were reworked by Mani himself for his own needs [cf. Chapter III]. That a Middle Persian version of some Avestan texts existed in Mani/Kirdēr's times¹⁵⁰, could be seen, e.g., from the fact that Kirdēr quoted Avesta in Middle Persian, *i.e.*, as a *Zand*, in §6-7 of his inscription, cf. Skjærvø 1983b:

W ZK- [w]gwn cygwn [PWN n]sky nm'dty AYK A[N]ŠWT[A AMT OBLWNOR]E
Z[Y dyny] p[yt'k?] [W MN]W [t'y ZK NPSE [dyny?] šk'y pt'y>rk'y
YATWNT W MNW [t'y OLE ZK NPSE dyny OL wh[yšty YBLW?N W MNW d]wndy
OLEC ZK NPSE dyny OL d[wšh]wy DBLW[N]t,

[w]gwnc[m KON [PWN zy]wndky pyt'k [yw YHWWN AYK OLE ODNA
AMT[O]B[LW]N[m APm ZK NPSE [dyny ZK-w]gwn ptyrk'y YA]TWNt W HT
[t'y [HWE]N ADYNm ZK NPSE dyny ZK-w]gwn pyt'k [yw YHWWN cygwn MNW
OL wh[yšty]wny OZLWNT W HT d]wndy HWE]N ADYN m ZK-w]gwn pyt'[k [yw
YHWWN cygw[n] M[NW] OL [d]wšhwy DBLWNT,

And in the same way as it is revealed [in the Na]sk that when people [pass on... And he who] is just, his own [dēn] comes to meet him ... And he who is just, him his own dēn [leads] to Paradise. And he who is wicked, him his own dēn leads to Hell.

[thus also] may it appear to me now in life, so that at the time when [I pass on, then my] own [dēn] comes [to meet me in that way]. And if [I am] just, [then] may [my] own dēn appear as the one who goes to Paradise! And if I am wicked, then [may] it appear to me just as the one who leads to [Hell]!

149 Cf. Chapter III.III "Mani and Zand".

150 The lifetime of the two men partly overlapped.

restored by Skjærvø 1983b, 290-1, as follows:

šaj mraoš Ahurō Mazda, "thus spoke Ahura Mazda",

š.š guft Ohrmazd kū, "He, Ohrmazd, said, that...", versus Kirdēr's hān ōwōn čīgōn [pad n]sk paydāg kū;

pasča para.iristahe mašilehe ..., rendered in the extant *Zand* as

pas az bē widirišn ī mardomān, "after the passing on of men", versus Kirdēr's mardom [ka (bē) widirēd];

Vd 19.30:

hā srira <hu>ḡṛta ... jasaiti ..., "the beautiful, the well-shaped is coming", rendered in the extant *Zand* as hān nēwag (pad dīdan) hugird ... rasēd ... "here arrives the brave [to look upon], the well-shaped", versus Kirdēr's *awē ī [dēn] paydāg, where the gloss dēn enables us to identify the passage; then,

hā ašāunam uruānō tarō haraṃ Barazaitīm āsanaoti tarō Cinuuaṣparatūm viđāraite haētō mainiauuanaṃ yazatanam,

rendered in the extant *Zand* as

hān ī ahlawān ruwān tarist hariburz wizihēnēd tarist az ēn cy'w widarg widirēnd (kē *yazdān) x^vēš ī mēnōgān yazdān,

she will draw the souls of the righteous ones beyond the Hariburz, the cross over beyond the Bridge of Separation which belongs to gods,

versus Kirdēr's

[ud kē] ardāy hān xvēš [dēn ...]šḡy *pad<ī>rag āyēd ud kē ardāy awē hān xvēš dēn ō wahišt [...];

Then, Vd 19.30:

hā druuatam ayam uruānam tamohuua nizarešaitē,

rendered in the extant *Zand* as¹⁵¹

hān ī druwandān wadag ruwān andar tam [kū gyāg ī tāriḡ ciyōn dušax^v] bē nayēnd (DḡLWNyynd),

they will lead these wicked souls of these evil persons to darkness [which is a dark place, like Hell].

¹⁵¹ Given in JamaspAsa 1982, 631, who does not specify where it is from; quoted in Skjærvø 1983b, 291 n.12. I did not find it in Anklesaria 1949.

versus Kirdēr's

ud kē druwand awēz hān x^vēš dēn ō dušax^v nayēnd¹⁵².

According to Skjærvø 1983b, 276, 290, Kirdēr's quotations are taken from the *Zand* to Vendidad [Vd 19.28-30]¹⁵³, "probably not [from] the Hādōxt Nask". However, in my opinion, there is a Gāēic passage which is a better candidate to be quoted by Kirdēr than a Vendidad or Hādōxt Nask passage; I suggest one has rather to see the Nask quoted by Kirdēr as actually derived from the Pahlavi Yasna 31.20.

These texts are interesting as they provide us with a Middle Persian Zoroastrian *Zand* basically not very different from that of our extant versions. What is worth notice now is the fact that [PWN n]sky nm'dty, "[as] it is demonstrated in a Nask", is a formula introducing a Scriptural quotation also in Manichaean Middle Persian, but it differs from the Zoroastrian Middle Persian, where we find *pad Dēn paydāg etc.; perhaps this difference implies that the Middle Persian versions of the Avesta were not yet arranged¹⁵⁴ as a complete corpus, but rather were organized as separate Nasks. Another possible explanation is that the term "Nask" was then identical with a unit of the Middle Persian *Zand*, but not with a unit of the Avestan texts.

Of course, other explanations are also possible. It is possible that in Mani/Kirdēr's times, the term *Zand*, previously used for "Avestan texts in vernacular", became associated too much closely with heretical teachings, like those of Mani himself. It took time, and an almost complete destruction of Manichaeans in Sasanian Iran, until the term reappeared in its original sense.

As the *Zand* was transmitted by priests who performed the communal cultic duties, they had to pronounce the Avestan text properly, resorting to the *manthric*¹⁵⁵ power inherent in the text.

¹⁵² Cf. Skjærvø 1983b, 289-91. The translation of the *Zand* passages is mine.

¹⁵³ Kellens 1975, 464, noting some contradictions between the known form of the Hādōxt Nask and some doctrines in the Kirdēr's inscriptions, wrote: "Personne mieux que Kartir, leader du clergé orthodoxe et, on le suppose, théologien éminent, ne pouvait connaître la tradition qui mène du Hādōxt Nask aux textes pehlevi. D'autre part, on ne peut imaginer qu'il se soit livré ici à une innovation douteuse et injustifiable. Il faut considérer qu'il fait état d'une variante orthodoxe, celle qui apparaît en filigrane des quelques lignes du V. [Vd] 19".

¹⁵⁴ The Arabic root NSQ, "to arrange", derives most probably from Iranian *nask.

¹⁵⁵ The Avestan māθra spānta was sometimes glossed as Abistāg, Abistāg ud Zand, cf. Phil Ardavahišt Yašt 5, ZXA 82.6, Oshar 1963, 190.

In Dadistān ī Dēnīg 44-45¹⁵⁶ it is stated that "it is incumbent on believers in the Good Religion to learn the script of the Avesta so that they may not make errors in the recitation of the Niyāyišn and the Yašt"¹⁵⁷. It is clear from this passage that the impetus to invent the Avestan script was the desire to avoid errors in the pronunciation of the sacred texts.

But as the Zoroastrian God is the Lord *Wisdom*, His Word revealed to Zoroaster had to be understood, so that every human being could choose the Good. The use of *Zand* implied that some basic understanding of the sacred text was desirable, if not required, from the laymen, that is, mere recitation of some formulae in Avestan was seen as insufficient to fight the evil.

This duality of the text's purpose, both its mantric power, and its need to be properly comprehended, were the factors which led to the emergence of a bilingual text, the Word of God in the "religious" tongue¹⁵⁸ coupled with its explanation in the common language.

At the same time, the emergence of the *Zand* as an exegetic translation in the common language implied the inclusion of Zoroastrianism into the Middle Eastern cultural milieu, where such a tradition of translation existed for thousands of years. The Islamic requirement to possess a *Scripture* in order to become considered as a *People of Scripture*, *ahlu l-kitāb*, seems to be an expression of a long held notion which was current not only among the Abrahamic denominations. The Written Corpus of *Zand* as we know it now was arranged only in the Islamic era with the purpose of obtaining the status of *People of Scripture*¹⁵⁹; this may be one of the reasons for composing the important literature that was dubbed as the *9th Century Books*, but these works were not "sacred", they did not pretend to have the status of Revelation, at best, they were comparable with *fīqh* or *ʿirf* works.

It is worth noting that there are some loose chronological parallels between the attitude to written translation of sacred texts in Iran and Israel: while in the first Muslim centuries we already find the fully-developed translations, into Aramaic or Pahlavi, in Israel and Iran, in earlier epochs, like the Second Commonwealth Period, there was some reluctance in Israel to

¹⁵⁶ Shaked 1969a, 191 n. 44.

¹⁵⁷ Inki bihdīnān rā mī bayād ki xaṭṭ ī Avistā biyāmozand peš ī hērbadān va ʔstādān tā dar xʷāndan ī Niyāyiš va Yašt xaṭṭ na ravād.

¹⁵⁸ Ewāz ī Abistāg nām, "the tongue called Avesta[n]", DkM 455.11, or ʔwāz ī dēnīg, "the religious/scriptural tongue", DD 36.41, are the Pahlavi names of the Avestan language; cf. Bailey 1943, 167.

¹⁵⁹ Emergence of Mandaeen "Sacred Scriptures" in the Early Islamic Period may serve as a good parallel, cf. D. Shapira, "The Making of the Mandaean Canon" (forthcoming).

translate the Holy Scriptures in writing; in the Parthian Period in Iran (chronologically partly overlapping the Second Commonwealth Period), there were, perhaps, no systematically written *Zand*-translations.

Iranians before Islamization were not, basically, "men of letters". Even in Firdausi's epoch, they saw writing as demonic, partly perhaps because the Plural form of "demon", dīwān, sounded to them as rhyming with the word for "office". Traditional religions feel no need to translate their tenets to the vernaculars on a large scale. A communal society that starts explaining to itself its own beliefs is a society in crisis: in Late Sasanian Iran, the "orthodoxy"¹⁶⁰ was seriously challenged by Christianity, Manichæism and Judaism, especially by the first two. Seeing Byzantium as the model in many respects, Sasanian Iranians spared no efforts to keep up, and it may be supposed that Ādurbād compiled his *Zand ī Khorde Avesta* as a replica of the Christian Psalter. Some Avestan texts were seen as referring to or even quoting Christian texts. *E.g.*, a Zoroastrian prayer (cf. Hampel 1974, 2), moulded perhaps on Christian and Jewish models, reads:

pad nām ī Yazdān. nām ī stāyišn ī awē ī Ohrmazd hamē būd ud hamē hast
ud hamē bawēd, nām ī Yazad spennāg mēnōg andar cē mēnōgān mēnōg ūš
xʷadāyīh ʔwag,

In the name of God. His, who is Ohrmazd, name of praise, ever was and ever is and ever will be, the name of God, the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Spirits, whose lordship is one.

Some Christian pieces were even incorporated into Zoroastrian texts, like DkM 498.17-18, which was seen by Asmussen 1965, 39, as a borrowing from 1 Cor.13.13:

Ūšān ʔnaz ʔʔn dāšt kū mēnōgān yazdān 3 čiš abēr nēwag, ʔnaz ʔdōn:
dōšāram, tars<ā>gīh ud ʔmēdag,

They also believe that three things are desirable to the spiritual gods, viz., love, piety, hope.

¹⁶⁰ It seems that the Zoroastrian emphasis on Dualism is due to the conflict with Western Monotheism, especially in its strictly Muslim form. The "orthodox" Zoroastrianism, that sees in Ohrmazd and Ahriman two almost equal powers, still was not imposed in the Sasanian period, cf. Shaked 1992-93, 146.

In other words, the Middle Persian *Zands* were open to influences. It stands clear from the above-quoted DkM 437.20-22 that authors of the Zoroastrian Middle Persian texts were aware of the fact that both right and false teachings were derived from the *Zand*. That is the reason why the orthodox are frequently required to keep secret the *Zand*¹⁶¹.

In Pahlavi, *zandīk*[g] means "one who interprets the Avesta and one who makes *Zands* without authority", and it was regarded to be a serious abuse. It was suggested that the Jewish term *Pharisees*, *pərōšīm*, Sng. *pərōš*, *pərōšā*, interpreted by Boyce as "Iranizers"¹⁶², is semantically connected to *zandīk*: "ones who make [oral] interpretation (*pərōš*¹⁶³) in a vernacular", referring to a practice well known the First Century CE Land of Israel - e.g. Jesus preaching in Aramaic in synagogues was one of such interpreters.

Every translation is, at the same time, interpretation and explanation. This is especially true when an attempt is made to explain the hidden meanings of a sacred text composed in a sacred - and, mostly, dead - language by means of a vernacular. When the situation is like that, it is only natural that the terms "translation" and "commentary, explanation" etc. became synonymous.

Even in our days, "to translate" is sometimes "to explain"; "to explain", on the other hand, shifts in some cases to "to translate". This is the case with languages with a long literary tradition where reading of classical texts requires some background in the ancient stage of the vernacular or in the genealogically related language. Thus, in Modern Chinese, *yī* means "to translate", but in ancient Chinese it has also the meaning "to explain"¹⁶⁴. In the Hebrew of the Biblical Book of Ezra, the term *məḡrāš* (Aramaic **məḡrāš*) was used, as it seems, for public reading of the Torah with a simultaneous exegetic translation into Aramaic. Schaefer 1930, 11, was not right when he stated that the real meaning of this much-discussed term, *məḡrāš*, was not known in the Mishna period, for we have in Megillah 3a *məḡrāš* *ze Targūm*, "məḡrāš means Targūm"¹⁶⁵.

161 Cf. Shaked 1969a, *passim*.

162 Cf. Boyce & Grenet 1991, 410, quoting Manson in n. 221.

163 This word *pərōš* is derived from the same root as *məḡrāš*, *məḡrāš*, cf. further. There is a strange phrase *zndky ZY yhw'd'n* in a graffito at the wall of the synagogue of Dura-Europos. Geiger 1956, 285 & 304-5, took it as identical with *Kantak* the *zandak* of the same inscription. However, the title makes no sense in this regard, and Sukenik 1947, 162 (top), stated that when the visitors wrote their graffiti, there were no Jews in the city.

164 Cf. Lin Wushu 1991, 231. Cf. also Latin *interpretari*, "translate" > "explain", cmp. Rabin 1976, 44.

165 Compare Schaefer 1930, 7, 12: *məḡrāš*/*məḡrāš*, glossed *məḡrāš*.

This means also that a Targūm was supposed to be not merely a translation¹⁶⁶, but also an exegesis, which applies fully to the Zoroastrian *Zand*.

In Arabic, *tafsīr*¹⁶⁷ is "translation" and *ṣarḥ* means "commentary"¹⁶⁸, while in Jewish vernaculars, as in Judæo-Persian (especially in Bukhara), e.g. *ṣarḥ* is sometimes used in both senses of *zand*, i.e., "translation" as well as "commentary". However, it is worth noting that in Hebrew and Palestinian Aramaic, both Samaritan and Jewish of the period of Arsacid and Sasanian rule over Iran, *bē'ēr* meant not only "to explain, interpret", but also simply "to write"¹⁶⁹.

In Iran proper, we do not often find the term *zandīk*. We hear about *zandīks* as "heretics" mostly from non-Iranian sources. On the other hand, we do not hear much about Avesta from non-Iranian sources, and the impression one may get from these sources is that there was no written Avesta¹⁷⁰ at all, only heretics composing their books, supposedly *Zands*.

The near absence of discussions about the Avesta in external sources, e.g. in Syriac¹⁷¹, could nevertheless be quite telling, if we combine this silence about the existence of Zoroastrian "books" with complaints, found in the same Syriac sources, about the secretive character of certain Magian teachings. This silence does not necessarily prove that the priests' teaching were not extant in writing, but that these texts circulated in other circles than those from which the Christian converts came.

Both ritual and teaching were performed by priests, who made efforts to restrict access to their monopoly¹⁷²; in the Sasanian period, the *Gāthās* were viewed as containing esoteric wisdom, thus barriers to their study were erected¹⁷³.

166 "TRGM means 'rendered onto a language', not necessarily by translation from another language", cf. Levine 1962, 34. In Yiddish, e.g., *fartaytsh* means not only "translated into 'Deutsch'", but also, simply, "explained"; similar examples could be easily provided from other languages, too. According to my own observations, Israeli children clearly tend to confuse *la'targem* and *la'farsht*.

167 *Tafsīr* derives from Aramaic *PSR*, a doublet of *PRS*. Compare Qumranic *pešer*.

168 Pines 1990, 45 n.16.

169 Cf. Ben-Hayyim 1968, 165ff., esp. 168. This might serve as a good semantic parallel to the Pahlavi *wizārīšn*.

170 The Western sources speak of 'psalms', not of books; cf. Nau 1927. Compare Christensen 1944, 516.

171 Those are of enormous importance, as many of Syriac martyrs and even many of the authors of these martyrologies were born as Zoroastrians, belonging, sometimes, to the priestly class.

172 'Ait b. Ḥazm's *Kitābu 'l-Faṣl fī 'l-milal wa'l-ahwā'*, cf. Pines 1990, 43, stated that *Anušīrwān* forbade the study [of the books] in any place in their country other than *Ardašīr Xorra* and *Eša M.n.dā Gird*. Before him (the religion) was only studied in *Istaxr*, and this was permitted to special élite. Their book which remained after it had been burnt by Alexander, contained 23 *sifr*.

173 Cf. Shaked 1969a.

Sometimes, in the later times, the *Zand* is referred to as a "secret", cf. the New Persian passage transcribed and translated in West 1904b, 112-1¹⁷⁴:

ān ki sirr ē, ba navān nīšt, ba xaṭṭ i Avistā, yā xaṭṭ i savād, avāyad nībišt ki ūzvāriš bēd,

That which is a secret, written to a scholar, one must write in Avestan writing, or the writing of blackness¹⁷⁵ which is ūzvāriš.

As the priests were those who transmitted the texts, especially after the fall of the Sasanian Empire, they were those who chose what is to be transmitted. The result is that the bulk of Pahlavi literature that survived is the literature of priests.

That is why amongst the texts that have reached us one finds a whole Vendidad Nask, considerable fragments of Nērangestān and Erbedestān in the Dēnkard and their Avestan originals and Pahlavi versions, etc., while other Nasks are summarized briefly, sometimes in a few words and some Nasks, like the astronomical (?) Naxtar [Nādar] Nask, whose name was seen as derived from Indic nakṣatra, "Gestirne"¹⁷⁶, was not handed down to us at all. In addition, Pahlavi translation and commentary, generally, develop the original contents concerning duties attached to sacerdotal office¹⁷⁷.

The House of Learning was called "the place of Priests", and, though we know from some sources that laymen went to study, orally, Avesta with *Zand* (Y 57.8, Visp 14.1, 16.0, mat .āzanti, "with *Zand*", abāg śnāsagīh ī zand, "with knowledge of *Zand*"¹⁷⁸), the greater bulk of the Avestan corpus was restricted to priests only. It is not a coincidence that when a layman boasts [PT 27-38, §§ 8-9] that he has memorized Avestan texts with their *Zand*, he mentions texts we still possess.

Thus, zandīk meant "one who makes exegesis without authority", with the emphasis on "without authority"; the word perhaps existed even before Mani, the zandīk *par excellence*, was born¹⁷⁹. Manichaeans were those who provoked the formation of orthodoxy and the appellative of "heretic" on themselves for the Zoroastrian Church of Sasanian Iran, cf. Frye 1992.

174 PrsRiv, quoted in West & Haug 1874, 169, note, asserts that the compilers of the Dēnkard "collected [only] some of the more essential (fariḍa-tar) mysteries of the religion (asrār ī dīn) as instruction, and these formed the book".

175 Actually, "scholarly writing", a good term for ūzvārišn.

176 Cf. Chapter I.

177 de Menasce 1983, 1176.

178 Cf. Schaefer 1930, 79 n. 5. Compare further.

179 Siddiqi, quoted in Schaefer 1930, 78.

It is worth noting, however, that the first appearance of the term *zndyky* in Middle Persian is found about Mani's times, in the inscriptions of his arch-fiend, Kirdēr [Naqš-i Rostam, KKZ 10 = Sar Mašhad 14, circa 290 CE], where there is little doubt that the Manichaeans are those meant¹⁸⁰: W yhwdy W šmny W bīmny W nʾēl'y W klstyd'n W mktky W *zndyky* BYN štly MHYTN YHWWND, "and the Jews, the Buddhists, the Brahmins, the Nazoreans, the Christians, the Baptists¹⁸¹ and the Manichaeans in the kingdom were struck down".

The *Zand* which gave the zandīks their name was not the *Zand* we have now, of course¹⁸². In Kirdēr's times, as was mentioned above, the "official" *Zand* was perhaps called Nask. The term *Zand* in DkM 412, referring to Vologeses' [Walaxš's] redaction of the Avesta, has the older meaning of some Avestan texts, and does not designate Middle Persian *Zand* (Tavadia 1956b, 55). We have sometimes examples, in Arabic or Armenian sources, of fragments of Sasanian *Zands* that are at odds with the extant Middle Persian *Zand*.

Thus, in Y 33.12, us mōi uzārašuuā Ahurā, "rise up to me, O Ahura", recited on adding fragrant wood to fire, the Pahlavi has ul man az hān ī rēšīdār [ahlamōg] Ōhrmazd, based on *arəšuuā. That is while one of the fire-temples founded by Mihr-Narsēh in the fifth century was called, according to Tabari¹⁸³, Frāz marā āwar xvadāyān, thus being a perfect rendering of the Avestan verse in question. Of course, this Avestan verse, used in a fire ceremony, is well appropriate to be used as a name of a fire-temple, and there can be no doubt that Frāz marā āwar xvadāyān used to be translated us mōi uzārašuuā Ahurā in the traditional (oral?) translation-interpretation in the fifth century CE.

The *Zand* we possess now is the *Zand* developed near the end of the Sasanian period, representing the orthodoxy which had by then taken root; the *Zand* we possess is the *Zand* of Fārs¹⁸⁴, based on the oral word-by-word translation of the Avestan texts, to which glosses were later added or from which new compositions based on such translations were made.

180 Frye 1992, 96-7.

181 Probably Mandaeans, cf. Bailey 1980 and *ib.*, 1985b. Back 1978: "Jains".

182 Cf. Schaefer 1930, 82, quoting Darmesteter.

183 Schwartz 1896, II, 69.

184 However, there are traces of other Middle Iranian dialects, especially Parthian, studied in many works of Widengren. On the other hand, Middle Persian ahlāmōy is not a continuation of the Avestan ašəmaoaya < *r̥tamaoaya > NP āšmōy, but is a genuine Persian form, like *Amahrspand or *fraward. According to the opinion of the "Scandinavian school", the Sasanian Avesta was codified under coalescence of traditions of Staxr and Stz, cf., e.g., Wikander 1946, *passim*, and Widengren 1968.

It is important to recall¹⁸⁵ that the Manichaean writings frequently use typical Pahlavi-Avestan technical terms, such as *ahlawān*, instead of the standard Middle Persian *ardāwān*; *haft ādur yaštaḡ*, having parallels as in Kirdēr's inscriptions; *ādur waxšān yōždah*, "the pure blazing fire"; *āb zōhr*, "libation of the waters", and others. This interesting fact can be explained in different ways, including the suggestion that Mani's Iranian writings were indeed created as *Zands* to Zoroaster's words¹⁸⁶. This may imply that the *Zands* were kept in high esteem.

There surely were different schools of *Zandists*: cf. the gloss to Y 30.4 & Dk 9.30.4 and MX 36.16 (Schäeder 1930, 87ff. [esp. 87-8 & 93]), in Sanskrit and New Persian versions, where *kē zandīgth kunēd* is explained in terms of **dēwayasna*; Mazdak, seen, of course, not as a social revolutionary, but as a *dēwayasnian* heretic, is known for "[he] made public a book which is called the *Zand*..." (Bosworth 1990, 12). The genealogy of the abusive meaning of the word *zandīk* is not clear-cut, as many factors joined together in developing this semantic shift. The secretive character of the official *Zand* as such, on the one hand, and subversive nature of unauthorized compositions, pretending to be based on Avesta, on the other, were among these factors. It might be also supposed that the term *zandīk* as meaning "heretic" was coined, *i.e.*, under the impact of the fact that Mani, who pretended to a better understanding of Zoroaster's words than the Magi did¹⁸⁷, interpreted the term *zandīk* in the sense of "he who knows"¹⁸⁸, thus **gnostic*. Indeed, in PY 32, *e.g.*, *zand* is rendered as *šnāsagīh*, "knowledge". Another plausible explanation is that Mani used the term for his *Electi* [Aramaic **bəḥīrē*, Pl.], as if from Aramaic¹⁸⁹ *zaddīq[ē]*¹⁹⁰ (Arabic *ṣiddīq*) meaning simply **ardāw[ān]*, "the righteous one[s]". I suggest that it was this meaning "the righteous one[s]" attributed by Mani to the word *zandīk* that provoked the use of the term "heretic[s]" by orthodox Magi.

Struggling against the Manichaean heresy, the Magi probably had to examine anew their own sources of authority. It is, however, certain that most (or all) of the Iranian versions were actually oral. The 5th century Armenian Eznik Kotbaci tells us that the Persian beliefs are not set down in writing, so that the Mazdæans are apt to say one thing, then another, cf. Russell 1985-6, 3-4.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Skjærvø 1998.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Chapter III.III "Mani and Zand".

¹⁸⁷ Cf. above.

¹⁸⁸ Indeed, the word *zand* is formed from the base with the meaning "to know", cf. above.

¹⁸⁹ Actually, Syriac, as the *z* consonant suggests.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Schäeder 1930, 84-5.

Still, some written anti-Manichaean propaganda, at least, formally based on *Zands*, was in circulation. We know this from several references to Mani and his teaching in the *Dēnkard*, *Skand Gumānīg Wizār* and other ninth century texts; these references were clearly based on some written records, as Manichæism was generally on the defensive in Iran. Other pieces of written propaganda and anti-propaganda also based on *Zands* were in use during the *Wahrām Cōbēn* mutiny (cf. Czeglédy 1957 and 1958)¹⁹¹. The struggle against the spreading Christianity also led the Magi to produce some written works, as we know from Armenian sources.

While on the defensive, the "orthodoxy" had to compose and even forge "Avestan" pieces. "The old texts are used in a flexible and quasi-prophetic manner which permits interweaving them with facts of a much later date. This is common practice in apocalyptic literature and is found again at Qumran, for example, where the text of Habakkuk is applied to the life of "the Master of Justice" (de Menasce 1983, 1174). In Zoroastrianism this system of interpretation is certainly earlier than the Muslim epoch, even though the end of the legend of Zoroaster includes the episode of the Arab conquest (*ibid.*, 1174).

Glossing work begins as early as in Young Avestan texts where sometimes the Old Avestan passages were explained. There are two passages in the *Vispered*, 14.1-2, and one in the *Hymn to Sraoša*, Yn 57, where *maī.āzaiṇtī* refers to the running exegetical remarks, while *maī. paiti.frasā-* refers to a kind of responsorium or catechisms, cf. Skjærvø 1998. *Yasna* 57.7-8 is as follows:

Sraošam ... yazamaide yō paoiriio gāōā frasrāuuaiiat ...
afsmānuuān vacastaštīuuat maī.āzaiṇtīš maī.paiti.frasā,

"We worship Sraoša ... who was the first to recite the Gāōās ... with
phrases and strophes, with commentaries, with counter-questions"¹⁹²,

and the Pahlavi there has:

¹⁹¹ Cf. Chapter IV.

¹⁹² Translation by Skjærvø, with a slight alternation; cf. also Kreyenbroek 1984, 38-41.

...kēš fradom Gāθān frāz srūd kēš ahlaw Zardu(x)št abāg *gaiθr* abāg vīcast¹⁹³ ud abāg šnāstīh ud Zand¹⁹⁴ ud abāg pursišnīhā [ī nērang] pad hān ī Amahrspndān yazīšn ud niyāyīšn ud šnāyēnīdārīh frāz āfarīgānīh,

Him who was the first to sing the Gāθās, who *is the righteous Zoroaster, with *gaiθr* (metric Gāθās), with vīcast (stanzas), with knowledge and the Zand and with questioning [about the nērang-formulas] as regards this worship of the Immortal Bountiful Ones, and the ritual, propitiation and Afrinagān prayers.

Here the Avestan *gaiθr*, translated by me as "metric Gāθās", refers to the original *mat. aṣmana*; in the Vispered (14.1) version *aṣmanīuuān* is rendered by abāg *gāh*, "with measured lines", thus reflecting the stage when "Gāθās" was still understood as "a unit of song", not as "the Gāθic corpus"; "with vīcast (stanzas)" renders *vacastaṣtiuuat*, "strophes", while "with commentaries", *mat. āzaintīš*, glossed *Zand*, was unmistakably taken as containing the word for "knowledge", thus translated abāg *šnāstīh*. "With counter-questions", *mat. paīti. frasa*, was rendered by a long gloss abāg *pursišnīhā [ī nērang] pad hān ī Amahrspndān yazīšn ud niyāyīšn ud šnāyēnīdārīh frāz āfarīgānīh*, referring to the way the Avestan text was learned, while the emphasis was put on the ritual implementations.

As Skjærvø has noted while dealing with Avestan *Zands*, the decorative arts of the Middle Iranians contain motifs the interpretation of which is very difficult, because the relevant literature was lost. However, some indications of how Avestan texts were interpreted one could find also in some non-textual sources, including representations in arts and coinage: thus, the crown of Hormizd II (r. 302-9) on his Marv dinar appears to depict the head of a bird, perhaps a cock rather than the eagle (Carter 1990, 15); according to Carter, the choice was a result of a *Zand* tradition, demonstrated in a Pahlavi gloss in Vd 1 (cf. Christensen 1943, 15), where the third best country created by Ahura Mazda was said to be not Marv, but "the vigilant cock".

193 Kreyenbroek: *wacast*, "verses".

194 Kreyenbroek: *šnāstīh* ī *Zand*, "and with knowledge of the commentary".

This implies that this particular *Zandic* tradition resulting in the confusion between *marw* / **murw* / *mury*, has existed in the early 4th century¹⁹⁵.

Another example of deviation from the 9th century Zoroastrianism is reflected in Manichæan teachings¹⁹⁶: Sundermann 1979a, 785 argued for an imaginative Middle Persian rendering of the Avestan of the Yt 10.115: **Mihr*, *ōh mānīg rad*, *wisīg*, *zandīg*, *dehīg*, *Zarduštrōtūm*, glossed as *Mihr*, *ōh mānbed wisbed*, *zandbed*, *dehybed*, *Zarduštrōtūm*.

Asking why Adamas was called by Mani *wisbed* and not **zandbed*, the title he deserved, Sundermann 1979a, 786 suggests that this was because of a very old - and wrong - variant reading in Yt 10.112, where Mithra is described as *vīspaitīm* (Acc) > *wisbed*, while the more correct reading is *vīspaitīm*, "broad-shouldered"¹⁹⁷. Thus, Sundermann wrote, "we may assume that also in the Sasanian times religious authorities of the Mazdayasnian church understood and explained the *hapax legomenon* *vīspaitīm* as a strange variant of the familiar *vīspaitīm* ..."¹⁹⁸.

It is well known how problematic is the grasping of the original meaning of Avestan, especially of Gāθic texts; in Dēnkard (DkM 459.8-22) the question is asked why God revealed his word in this incomprehensible language; the *Mānōār*, "manthric power", and the *Dēn. Abistāg* *harwīsp. āgāhīh*, "the complete wisdom of the Avesta", are so *wīdīmāstīg*, "miraculous", that have passed from all the comprehension of men¹⁹⁹.

195 It seems that there were in existence some practices of "illustrative *Zands*", of the type of Mani's famous *Aržang* (or the later illustrated MSs), and Sasanian bas-reliefs were perhaps influenced by illustrated books mentioned by Arabic authors, cf. Ghirshman 1965, 5. On the interaction of written sources with arts, on an Armenian bas-relief, *Šīmury* / *Sēnmurw* is depicted in the manner the creature was described in the Bundahišn, namely, *sē angurāg*, "three-fingered", cf. Russell 1990-91, 143.

196 That *Zands* existed in Mani's times one could see, e.g., from the fact that the Zoroastrian idea of *ēbgad* was known to Mani: "in the lowest Firmament they (the Demons transformed by Mani into Angels) bored a hole and suspended the Zodiac from it. Two Sons of God were placed by them (there) as watchers, so as to... the Superior Wheel continually", Henning 1948, 313 [cf. also Chapter III. APPENDIX *Fragān*].

197 Gershevitch 1959, 261, n.112.2, quoted in Sundermann 1979a, 787.

198 Cf. Sundermann 1979a, 784, but cf. also Bivar 1988, 13.

199 On this basis, Gikyō Itō 1974, with good bibliography, connected Avesta to words meaning "what keeps away from, what stands apart, what rejects [our human knowledge]".

This Manthric *widmāstgTh of the Avesta means that all the knowledge is compressed in the holy sounds of the language²⁰⁰, thus *Zand* is not but a rendering, as opposed to translation in the Western sense. *Zand* cannot "translate", it can render one - or more - layer[s] of the profound meanings of the Avestan utterances, but it is unable, written or oral, to imitate the might of the Avestan recital. It seems that in the Late Antiquity there was no notion of a Holy Language, study of which would promote better understanding of the Lord's Will²⁰¹. Still, there is a difference: the Western cultures, Jewish or Christian, have no manthric overtones [or, very marginal ones], while in the Zoroastrian Iran, Avestan was not a Sacred Language in our sense: ud Zand pad ēwēnag ē guft ēstēd pad miyān ī gēhān rawāg.tar andar gēhān āšnāg.tar xvad Abistāg, "and the *Zand* is expressed in the manner as the Avesta itself becomes more current amidst the world and more familiar in the world". The difference between the Avesta and its *Zand* is self-evident: you cannot perform the ritual in the vernacular, exactly as you cannot spread, in the Avestan language, the message of Ahura Mazda revealed in Avestan: the tool of revelation and the tool of propagation are not identical²⁰².

200 This widmāstg could perhaps be seen as one of the sources of the Arabic l'gāz idea; with Arabs, it means that the language of the Koran cannot be surpassed; with Zoroastrians, the supreme wisdom of the Lord Wisdom as expressed in Avestan has some demons-destroying power. In passing, it should be noted that the Avestan alphabet, perhaps the next thing to our modern transcriptions and, no doubt, the most precise alphabet of the Late Antiquity, was invented to meet the need of correct pronunciation of Avestan, not to read texts in this language (cf. Hoffmann 1979, 90). This contrast between two alphabets, the extraordinarily phonetic Avestan script, and the Pahlavi, perhaps the most awful alphabet ever existing in this part of the world, is striking. The very precision of the Avestan alphabet reveals its later provenance.

201 In the West, *Veritas Hebraica* was a function of a highly developed Hellenistic philological tradition; the later *Back-to-the-Sources* movements represented, above all, tendencies of exegesis, and should be seen in the Judæo-Christian context. There remains this intriguing question of the status of Hebrew among Jews during the first Christian millennium.

202 The Avestan was probably seen as belonging to the mēnōg world of ideal possibilities, while *Zand* was its gēttg realization. In an anachronistic late Sasanian reference to the existence of the Avestan script in Zoroaster's times (Wizīrkard ī Dēnīg 17, cf. Molé 1967, 132-3) we read: pas hān awē āta(x)š abar hān dādihā gāh nišānēd, ud kišt ī hān draxt ī sarwān, uš andar zamīg kišt, clyōn kadiš ul rasīd, ud har warg ī kad az *šāx hamāg waxšīd, apar hān ī awē warg pad framān ī Ohrmazd mēnōgihā nibišt būd pad māhrīg ī abēzag, ku: "ē kay Wištāsp, Dēn ī Wēh bē padīr", "then he (Zoroaster) placed this Fire on its appointed place, according to the statute, and planted the cypress-tree; he planted it into the earth; when it grew forth, and every leaf has grown from its branch, one every leaf, by Ohrmazd's order, there was written, in a spiritual manner, in the holy language / in the pure script, saying: "O Kay Wištāsp, accept the Good Religion!". Though the expression used is ambiguous (Molé 1967, p. 133: "en lettres pures"), it is, however, clear that this text presupposes that someone at Wištāsp's court was able to read, and the message was written in Avestan (either the script, or the language, or both), seen as belonging to the mēnōg dimension. I would add, in passing, that the text (which is a version of the story of the conversion of the King Wištāsp) demonstrates, otherwise, many Buddhist and Christian-looking embellishments.

The expression used, "more current", rawāg.tar, does not mean the same as "as current as", the *Zand* cannot reveal all the levels of the Avesta²⁰³, because these are embodied in the very sounds of the manthric formulas, not in the "message" as such, or in the letters, as in some other traditions.

It seems that the historically fortuitous situation - the gradual withering of Avestan and its transplantation on a linguistically different ground in the Iranian West - has gotten a theological explanation which resulted not only in emphasizing of the hidden power of Avestan, but also in the actual substitution of the *Zand* for the Avesta. This led to a situation in which we at times are unable to decide whether the sources speak of the Avesta or of the *Zand*, as the terms are interchangeable. In fact, the *Zand* did become the ultimate source of the Avestan (in the sense of "Scriptural") lore, having undergone a process of certain secularization.

As the Avesta was supposed to contain everything, introduction to the *Zand* of foreign or non-religious material, when fitting, also became possible. However, Avestan texts were still studied not only for liturgic purposes, though on a low scale. They must have been read mostly against their Pahlavi translation, surely compiled, *grasso modo*, several centuries before the Canon was set during Anōšurwān's rule.

Thus, the interpretation of Avestan texts was based mostly on Tradition, not on independent study; as Shaked 1994b, 79-80, noted: "studying Avesta and *Zand* could have been one of the highest signs of piety, but it never became a major act of religious devotion, as Torah learning on Judaism and as Qur'ān and allied study later became in Islam". In Gathic texts, the translation seems to be interlinear, while, as a rule, each Avestan word is rendered by a fixed Middle Persian word²⁰⁴. In many cases, the Pahlavi sentence could be only understood when read with the Avestan original. Such practice was common centuries later in Judæo-Persian Bible translation, and in some other examples. To these, glosses are added, in many cases bearing exegetical attitudes.

203 This is why at least three different veins, or attitudes, of the interpretations were developed, represented by the exegeses of the same text in the Sitūdgar, Warštmanšar, Bag Nask, cf. Chapter II.

204 However, it is not uncommon that an Avestan word is rendered by more than one Middle Persian word: xveškar ud tuxšāg explains xvarənanhar, DkM 312.21ff., Bailey 1943, 37. Besides, in Dēnkard, cases of glossed hendiads are fairly common, cf. DkM 456.15, MRYA ud saxvarē AWN 16.7, AYNH čašm, Bailey 1943, 3.

In the Denkard paraphrase of Nasks, sometimes Pahlavi *Zands* are quoted at length, but in many cases they serve as a jumping-board to compose *Midrashic* style texts [cf. Shaked 1979, xviii]. The most normal glosses, especially in the Gatha, are the so-called "etymological" glosses, as, e.g. [Bailey 1953, 115], Gathic *hākura-*, "co-operation", Middle Persian *hamkardār*h, from *kur-*, "to be produced"; some "etymological" glosses of this kind are "wrong", in our view, and some of them are clearly what can be called "glosses by phonic similarity". Puns and plays on double meanings, that are common-place [Shaked 1979, xxlii-xxiv], also might be characterized as "glosses by phonic similarity".

Such "glosses by phonic similarity" may be etymologically "correct", and they may be not [cmp. Molé 1967, 5-6]. Sometimes, a particular Middle Persian word is known to denote a specific concept only from the living Zoroastrian tradition, as is the case, e.g., with Avestan *haōaēnaē-pātā-* "with seeds", Middle Persian *hōrp*ḍ, interpreted as "pomegranate"²⁰⁵. Avestan *āpam saokantavaitīm*, "oath-water", was misinterpreted as "sulphurous water" (Middle Persian *āb ī gōgirdōmand*), but the original chief ingredient is indicated by the next adjective, *zaranīdūuaitīm* "containing gold" (Middle Persian *zarrōmand* [New Persian *zarr-āb*] in *Saugand-Namah*)²⁰⁶. In many cases, the Middle Persian glosses are helpful for establishing the correct Avestan text²⁰⁷. Sometimes it is not easy to tell whether a particular gloss is a "correct" rendering of a given Avestan word, or the Avestan word in question was interpreted by some similarly sounding Middle Persian counterpart, but rendered by another, synonymous, Middle Persian word. Thus, in the case of the widely discussed²⁰⁸ Avestan (Y 32.12) *gr̥hma* explained as *xvāstak* = "wealth" (*lakṣmi*) or *pārag*²⁰⁹, "presents, bribe", it is possible that it was rendered in this way on the basis of the Middle Persian transliteration (**gl̥hm*). The Middle Persian word transliterated may have been understood as the real Middle Persian *gl̥mk* = *grāmak* (connected to Sogdian *γrāmē*, Parthian *gr̥mg* "possession"); the other possibility is that the Middle Persian word is not a transliteration, but continues the same Avestan word. This particular case is illustrative of the problems one faces while dealing with the still elusive Gāthic text.

Another example of how transliterations and exegetic commentary could be interrelated is GrBd 186 l.11-12, Bailey 1930-32b, 279f.: *but dēw hān kēš pad Hindūgān paristēnd ūš waxš pad hān buthā mehmān* <ī> *ciyōn Bōdāsaf paristēd*, "the demon But is that which they worship in India and in his images a spirit is resident which is worshipped as Bōdāsaf (*Bodhisattva, via Sogdian *pwtysṭ*)". The word in question is Sogdian *pwt*y 'Buddha', *pwt*ḥḥk 'of Buddha' > New Persian *but*, "idol", Uigur *burxan* (*Buddhasangha).

The *bwt* of the passage is intended to represent the Avestan *Būiti*, Vd 19.1,2,43, a fact which may reflect an insufficient understanding of an inflected language²¹⁰. Another example is, of course, the well-known case of the "Arīš Demon"²¹¹, who, according to scholars, emerged from a grammatically wrong interpretation of the feminine noun *arašay-* (Y 31.5, cf. Dk 9.31.6-11) [cf. Chapter III.1: *Arīš* and *Mahmī*]. However, the *Zand* glossators were aware of the different grammatical structure of their own language as compared with Avestan: the Avestan-Middle Persian glossary *Frahang ī OTm ēwag* includes some grammatical categories like cases²¹².

In any case, "however critical one may be towards the Tradition, as contained in Pahlavi translations, there is no denying that it has often preserved the true meaning of word-stems even where it failed ...in the grammatical analysis. Purely on the basis of experience I should claim that a Pahlavi translation sets up a presumption of verity that holds until it is displaced by argument"²¹³.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Bailey 1985b, 871. However, on this word, cf. Schwartz in Flattery 1979, VIII, 111-3.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Schwartz, 1989b, 295.

²⁰⁷ Vd 13.9, *spāna pašu.pāna*, *sag ī puhlbān*, has another reading which is: *spāna pašupāna*, *hast kē abzōntg ī puhltg gōwēd yayd asti anyō Rašnuš razīšto*, "there are some who say about the helping bridge, of which one is Rašnuš razīšto", cf. Klima 1964.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Henning 1948, 139, n. 5, differently Humbach 1991, II, 86.

²⁰⁹ Cf. *prg* < *p̄rg*, *kr̥g*, on which cf. now Sabato 1995; Arabic/Turkish *para*, "a coin".

²¹⁰ Cf. Bailey 1930-32b, 282.

²¹¹ Cf. Molé 1963, 204.

²¹² Cf. Yavadian 1956b, 37. For more examples for the *Zandists'* awareness of Avestan grammatical categories, cf. now Josephson 1997, 120ff.

²¹³ Cf. Henning 1964, 43.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE

What is amazing about this passage (Y 31.20) is the fact that the text as a whole was understood by the tradition pretty well. The basic discrepancy is, however, in 31.20a, where the key-word, *diuamnəm*, which is a *hapax* (AiW 747a: "sich fern haltend, fern bleibend"), was taken as if from the same root as *dab-* [*frēbišn* translates also *daibitānā* in Y 32.3, and *frēftan* is the standard translation for the derivatives of *dab-*]; in addition, the grammatical form was wrongly analyzed. I, however, take *diuamnəm*, with Humbach 1991, II, 74, as "splendor", as opposed to *təmaḡθ*, similarly to the Indic apposition *tāmaḡ... dymnām*, "darkness... splendor".

The *Zand šēwan* is the standard rendering of *xšīa-*, being its etymon. However, the meaning is that of lament and crying in Pahlavi, but that of weeping in Avestan.

The Avestan *šīiθ*, "existence", is rendered as if a verbal form from the verb of coming and is translated *šyīšn*; the gloss, *diḡr zamān*, modifies the proper meaning of the word. It also suggests that the wicked should stay in Hell for a long period of time, but does not state that they are destined to be there forever. As to *duš.xv arəθəm*, it is normally translated by *duš.xv arišn*, glossed by the Pāzand *visāca*, "even poison".

This gloss was perhaps provoked, i.e., by the phonetic resemblance to the problematic *vacō*. The gloss specifies the sort of food given to the wicked in Hell. *vacō* also is the source of the *Zandist's* *gōwēd* in 31.20b, implying that (as often happens in *Zands*) two independent traditions appear side by side.

auuaētās vacō, "the word 'woe'" (cf. AiW 168: "Wehe'tum"), is wrongly analyzed as **a-vahya-tāt*, where *anāg* renders **a-vahya*, "not good > evil", and *rawiśn* indicates an abstract²¹⁴, for *rawiśn* translating *-tāt* has the same source as the pair *Amərətāt* and *Huruuatāt*, rendered *amargrawiśn* and *hamāg rawiśn* (cf. West 1892, 338 n.1).

The gloss [*kūš anāg mad ēstēd*] modifies the notion of "movement/enter" and seems to be a recent addition. It is not implied here that the whole verse was translated as late as this period (Late Sasanian, cf. above): the equation *diuamnəm*, ***with deceitful mind*, rendered by the Pahlavi version as *pad frēbišn*, "in deception", seems to me to be very old.

²¹⁴ Prof. Sh. Shaked, an oral communication. Another explanations are possible: **evil* (**avai-*) **movement* (*taz- / tas-*) + ***speaking*, *anāg rawiśn* *gōwēd*. As **taz-* is a Late Middle Iranian form, **tak- > tač- > taz-*, this particular passage goes back to the late Sasanian period.

I suggest that the original meaning restored by Humbach was still known at some ancient stage of the development of exegetical tradition. I also suggest that, on the one hand, it influenced what I see as the older, now lost, *Zand* of 31.20c (cf. further), while on the other hand, the popular etymology and the specific Zoroastrian exegesis associated the root of *diuamnəm*, the same root as in the word *daēva-*, with deception. As the word in question, "splendor", has the same root as *daēva-* has, so in the course of the "de-daēvification" (cf. Gershevitch 1964a, Gershevitch 1986) the Tradition re-interpreted it as if from *dab-*, bearing in mind that "deception", Pahlavi *frēbišn*, is the characteristic trait of the Zoroastrian *dēws*. I suggest to see the impact of the older understanding of *diuamnəm*, as connected with splendor and light, in the older version of *anāg rawiśn* *gōwēd* that had *anāg *rōšn* *gōwēd*, "he should call evil the light". Note the gloss "i.e., evil comes to him" and the following "to the world of darkness will lead you".

In my view, this conjectural restoration of the text is connected with the original meaning of *diuamnəm*, "splendor, brilliant things". I further will try to show that in other cases it is possible to trace other "concentric ring"²¹⁵ translations (cf. Chapter II).

Another striking fact about *diuamnəm* *hōi aparəm xšīiθ / pad frēbišn awē az pasəš šēwan*, is that *aparəm* is rendered *az pasəš*, though the standard translation for *aparəm* is *ābar*.

The Dēnkard (Dk 9.31.24; DkM 835.5-8) version of this passage is:

ud rasīdan ī pad stōš pad passəxt ī ata(x)š ī abzōnīg θ ayārīh ud bōzāgīh ī
ahlawān ud šēwan rawiśnīh awē kē mard ī ahlaw frēbēd ud bēšēdud nīdan ī
druwandān x^vēš abāyīstan kardan θ dušax^v,

"Also about arrival to the assistance and salvation of the righteous, in the fourth morning after death, through the ordeal of the propitious fire; and the lamenting behavior of him who deceives and vexes a righteous man, and leading the wicked by their own fitting deeds to Hell".

²¹⁵ To use, in a different meaning, the term coined by Schwartz 1989a.

It is of interest that in the text the word corresponding to *dēn or *kunišn, when speaking of the wicked ones' daēnā, is x^vēš abāyistan kardan, "[one's] own fitting deed[s]". As a whole, the passage is a commentary on the Yasna verse in question, strengthening my suggestion that diuamnam was once understood in its original sense, as the commentary speaks of death (cf. stōš, "the fourth morning after death") and the salvation of the righteous, normally associated with the "bliss", "splendor" (diuamnam must be close in meaning to wrāza-, on which cf. Kuiper 1964). Here, it is referred to as pad passāxt ī ata(x)š ī abzōnīg.

But the whole meaning of the Dk version is different from that of the Avestan verse and its Pahlavi Zand: in the Gāθā, one who assists the righteous, i.e., a follower of Zoroaster, obtains the bliss; in the Zand one who comes with XXX to the righteous, i.e., to a pious Zoroastrian, obtains XXX. "XXX" here stands for concepts understood differently by the Zandist, but the basic sense of the statement was not changed. For doing so and so to a living Zoroastrian, one gets in *his* after-life, such and such reward.

Differently from this, the Dk version takes "the righteous" as signifying not a living person, but a Zoroastrian who passed away²¹⁶. The Dk version speaks of the after-life of this deceased pious Zoroastrian. The salvation of this dead pious person seems to be obtained by some manipulations with the sacred fire by the living fellows. The meaning of Y 31.20bc in the three texts, including the Dk version, poses no problem and is basically the same.

That is why I stated that the Pahlavi Version of this verse as a whole is remarkably truthful to the Avestan original. Again, the Dk version speaks of the misdeeds of a wicked and deceitful person towards the righteous one, and about the sorrowful fate of this wicked person, according to his *own* "fitting deed[s]".

The wicked ones should be led to Hell, as it must be done with them. The last statement in the Dk versions goes back to a gloss in the Zand. The Dk passage is a reworking of the Pahlavi Yasna text, but it includes some additional material, going back to a lost commentary, not necessarily to a slightly different Zand.

A different understanding of the word diuamnam, as compared with our extant Zand, was contained perhaps in a gloss in the commentary: "*and some say, that diuamnam means obtaining the bliss by performing some rites connected with fire".

It was perhaps not stated in the supposed gloss, *who* obtains the bliss, one who is righteous or one who performs the rites for the soul of the righteous. Another important point is that the Dēnkar d version, in general, contains "mistakes" that result from its being an abbreviated

version.

Thus, a slightly clumsy nīdan ī druwandān x^vēš abāyistan kardan ō dušax^v, where the words dēn and kunišn were omitted, is an abbreviation of the perfectly intelligible a.tān kunišn ī x^vēš dēn nayēd [kardan abāyēstan].

The case of šēwan rawištāh is different: it may be a lost - and good - Zand to Avestan auuaētās, but it may be also a result of an abbreviation and re-working of šēwan ... anāg rawištāh.

²¹⁶ On some aspects of the "righteous dead" complex, cf. Shapira 1997, 226-229. I will elaborate the subject elsewhere.

Nasks Summarized: Dēnkard 8

In this chapter the contents of Dk 8 will be discussed, aiming to provide an outline of the Sasanian Avesta. In APPENDIX I, some of the chapters of Dk 8 summarizing the contents of the Sasanian Avesta are given, edited and translated¹.

Dk 8, the fifth extant book of Dēnkard, is especially precious as it is our main source about the contents of the Sasanian Avesta, as known in the 9th century CE in Iran. Some parts of the sacred Zoroastrian Canon were lost already when the text of Dk 8 was composed, and there can be little doubt that the compiler was sometimes urged to draw upon some secondary sources, of a character similar to the format of his own work.

The division of Dk 8 to chapters seems to go back to the compiler himself, as it reflects his own interests, on the one hand, and the preservice of the original material, on the other. Every chapter in the extant composition, except the introductory one, is dedicated to a particular Nask or to a section of a Nask.

The room given to different Nasks in Dk 8 is unequal²: thus, e.g., the three Gāθīg Nasks, namely S[t]ūdgār, Warštmanšār, Bag, are summarized in a few sentences. Nevertheless, in this particular case, the reason for the brevity in which these three Nasks are summarized in Dk 8 is their more extended exposition that makes the entirety of Dk 9. In other words, this is an indication that inclusion of the detailed summary of these three Nasks into the format of the compiler's work was his initial intention. In other cases, a Nask is summarized at length in a fair way, as the Vendīdād (or, Jud.dēw.dād/Widēwdād) Nask, which is the only Nask we possess in its completeness of the whole of the Avesta³. This detailed summarization, on the other hand, indicates that no more room was supposed to be given to this Nasks in further books of Dk. But as a rule, the more place is given to a Nask in Dk 8, the less it has survived.

1 Many chapters edited here were already published, partly or in whole, in transliteration by different scholars, first of all, by Molé 1963; the only complete translation is that by West 1892, which is frequently inadequate, but still admirable; his notes and readings are of special importance. The chapters summarizing contents of several Nasks, namely of the Nikāiūm, Duzd.sar.nijad, Hūspāram, Sakāiūm, Vendīdād (Jud.dēw.dād/Widēwdād) Nasks will be not translated here, for a variety of reasons.

2 Cf. Dk 8.1.4: "the categories [of the Avesta] are more summarized in the divisions, summarized in the parts of the divisions, and more detailed in the sections of the parts".

3 This Nask, in the original Avestan (as the so-called Vendidad Sadeh), must be recited every day by priests. The fact that the text was used on a daily basis forwarded not only its preservice in Avestan, but also in Pahlavi as well.

In the cases of Nikāiūm, Duzd.sar.nijad, Sakāiūm, we have nothing identifiable left outside the summary in Dk 8; some few fragards survived from the Hūspāram Nask; two Nasks, Nādar and Pājag, were virtually lost about the time when Dk 8 was composed.

The original division to chapters of Dk 8 - or, of its source, if one suggests that it was a secondary compilation on which Dk 8 was modelled, rather than the genuine Sasanian Avesta, in its entire or only partial form - was, probably, different from what we possess now. The extant text of Dk 8 is divided into 45 chapters, but⁴ the original exposition probably consisted of three parts, each of seven chapters, according to the number of Nasks in each group (plus the introductory chapter), thus, a total of 22 chapters.

However, the introductory chapter (Dk 8.1), which was most probably derived from an unknown composition, arranges the Nask according to two different systems: in Dk 8.1.9-11 the Nask are enumerated according to three groups, seven Nasks in each, what perhaps was in accordance with the presupposed division into 21-22 chapters, while in Dk 8.1.12 the sequence is given as it must appear in the Avesta along the lines of the liturgical-magical principles⁵, closely reminiscent of the double system of enumeration of the Avestan Gāθās and Yašt's. The summary of the Nasks that follows the introductory chapter was arranged according to the second system, as the Nask should appear in an ideal edition of the whole complete Sasanian Avesta.

The introductory chapter explains the principles on which the Nasks build up the Avesta. The eighth book of the Dēnkard states implicitly (Dk 8.1.2) that its concerns are "about the summary of what occurs in the Nasks of the Mazda-worshipping Religion, each one separately".

It is clear, even from this short statement, that the most shallow knowledge of what the particulars of the Avesta were about and their order were far from being the common lot. This situation was a function of Zoroastrian attitudes to the sacred texts rather than a result of negligence or a consequence of the Arab assault. On the contrary, the idea to produce this precious "reference-book" which is Dk 8, was perhaps a testimony of an emerging awareness to problems of religious education (cf. Dk 8.1.3, "for the knowledge of many").

The problematic⁶ word šāddōrwān, translated by me as "pond", refers, in my view, to the secondary source about the Pahlavi versions of the Avestan Nasks, not to the Zands of the Nasks: "the memory of that which is in the pond of this book concerning the categories of the Good Religion was written down and announced" (Dk 8.1.3). The word ššmurīšn, rendered by me⁷

4 According to Kellens 1989a, 37, and Gignoux 1996a, 288a.

5 On some aspects of which, cf. Shahbazi 1994.

6 Cf. n. 4 to the translation of Dk 8.1.

7 After Shaked, *ibid.*

as "category", in the sense of "status", was used in Dk 8.1.5 as synonymous with *bazišn*, "division, one of the three divisions of the Avestan Nasks", implying that the supposed source was dealing with different characteristics of the three groups of the Nasks⁸. This source was derived "from the *Zand*", glossed by "[which is Avesta (Dēn)]", while it was stressed that this *Zand* existed in a written and authoritative form ("written as an authority")⁹. There seems to be an apposition between "written down and announced", which is the *Zand*, "written as an authority for the commonalty in teaching the wisdom", and its source, from which this "written down and announced" text derives, namely "the [uttered] word (*ēwāz*) of the Avesta itself".

The expression *hān ī Dēn* (in which I see a gloss to the word "*Zand*") may refer to the fact that *andar dēn* serves to introduce a quotation from *Zand*¹⁰. Here I translate *hān ī Dēn* boldly as "Avesta", and not "Religion"¹¹, or "revelation"¹², bearing in mind the tentative character of such a translation. The term is not ambiguous by itself, but poses a problem of translating it into a foreign language. In the Zoroastrian tradition, it was Zoroaster's encounter with Vohu Manah that led to the revelation and Zoroaster's prophecy; the same encounter delivered to us his Avesta and its *Zand*, according to the Zoroastrian Sacred Tradition, no matter which parts of it go back to Zoroaster himself¹³. The Zoroastrian concept of the sacred language is different from the Western, i.e., the Hellenistic-Christian one, which is focused on teaching/study, on a better understanding of the text. The Zoroastrian attitude, on the contrary, stresses cultic purposes, so there is no gap in Zoroastrianism between the Avestan text and its rendering into a common language, as far as study is concerned. For the Zoroastrian Tradition, the *Zand* is the Avesta, as the *Zand* is still believed to be revealed by Ohrmazd to Zoroaster, compare "*Naskīhā ī Dēn ī Mazdēsn*"¹⁴ in Dk 8.12: in our view, the "religion" has no "Nasks", it is

8 Cf. also Dk 8.1.4: *nibištan ēwēn abar dōmurišn ī Dēn ī Mazdēsn bazišn*, "there is ordinance to write about the division of the categories of the Mazda-worshipping Religion".

9 A composition written is referred to also in Dk 8.1.15: *ud paywastan ī frāz d abdom ī Hāšō[k].Mānōrīg *waštag bahr az Gāōān ciyōn nibišt ī andar paywand ī d abdom Hāšō[k].Mānōrīg wištāsp.Sāst*, "And the linkage of *waštag*, a part of the *Gāōā*, to the end of *Hada-Mānōrīg*, is because it is written in connection with *Wištāsp.Sāst*, the end of *Hāšō.Mānōrīg*". Cf. also Dk 8.1.6 (*ēd ī 3 nibišt*, "these three are written"), and *passim*.

10 As was noted by Shaked 1969, 192, concerning the passage in question Dk 8.1.1-3.

11 As it was translated by Molé 1963, 63; Shaked 1969, 192; Cereti 1997, 99. Cf. Introduction.

12 As was done by West 1892, 1.

13 There can be little doubt about the fact that the work of exegesis has begun in the prophet's own days or immediately after him. Thus, the kernel of the *Zand* must be almost as old as the Avestan texts themselves.

14 Translated, nevertheless, as "the Nasks of the Mazda-worshipping Religion".

the Avesta that does, while the "Religion" is divided into three "levels"¹⁵, *Gāōīg*, *Hāšō.Mānōrīg*, *Dādīg*¹⁶. Here, "the *Zand*, which is Avesta/Religion (*Dēn*), for the knowledge of many" implies that the Avesta in its original tongue was not supposed to be understood, for that or other reasons, by "the many"; moreover, it was "written as an authority for the commonalty in teaching the wisdom", where the expression used,

pad āgāh dahišnīh, is reminiscent of *Zand āgāhīh*, the other name of *Bundahišn*¹⁷, a composition based on *Zands*. Thus, *āgāh dahišnīh* means perhaps something like *Zand*. "Written by the [uttered] word of the Avesta itself", *ēwāz ī Dēn nibišt*, refers to the written translation of the Avestan text, as *ēwāz* means "pronounced word", opposed to *wāzag*, "word" in the sense of *Zand*¹⁸. One should quote here Dk 8.3.3:

abar har ciš wāzag zand ud xʷašradagaz ciyōn hān ī gōwēd kū:

"*warštmanšār kē pad harwisp frāz gōwišnīh frāz dād ēstād*",

"*Zand* on every thing and every word, with a good arrangement, such as one says:

"*warštmanšār* is that that has given forth an exposition of everything".

In Dk 8.1.6 we are told that "the categories of the Religion is the exposition (*Dēn dōmurišn nigēz*)¹⁹ of Complete Knowledge (*wisp.dānišn*), Action (*kār*), and Ordinance (*ēwēnag*) of the knowledge and action of the whole Religion (*ham Dēn dānišn ud kunišn*)".

These three notions, "Complete Knowledge, Action, Ordinance", correspond perhaps to the well-known "Zoroastrian Triad": "good thought, good speech, good deed", while the order is different, putting "Action" = "deed" in the second place, while *ēwēnag*, "custom, manner", translated here "Ordinance", stands for "speech". It is of interest that the word *ēwēnag*, standing for "speech", became also the word for "a written text"²⁰. It is "speech" that links "thought" to

15 Dk 8.1.5: "the categories of the Mazda-worshipping Religion contain three divisions".

16 Compare Dk 8.1.4: "the division of the categories of the Mazda-worshipping Religion, to demonstrate its [the Religion's] divisions, parts, and the sections of the parts".

17 Though both names of this work are recent, it is not relevant for us here.

18 On which, cf. Shaked 1969, 187.

19 This word probably refers not to a literary source, but to a method of interpreting, cf. Gignoux 1996a, 285b.

20 Cf. New Persian *āʾīn*, *āyīn*, especially in the compound *āyīn-nāmāh*.

"action", being here the third division of the categories of the Religion, *Haðā.Mānōr*, which was, basically, a "ritualistic", i.e., connected to words as pronounced in the ritual, division of the Avesta.

The triple division of the Avesta was seen (Dk 8.1.6, 18-19; Dk 8.46.1 and *passim*) as a projection of the "ideal" (to use a Platonic expression) prayer Ahunvar (Avestan Ahuna Vairya, also called the *Yaθā ahū vairiō*), consisting of three metrical lines (*gāh-s*) [APPENDIX II].

This is the most sacred formula of the Zoroastrians²¹; the name is derived from its second and third words. The formula is consisting of one stanza of three lines, containing twenty-one Avesta words. Each *gāh* corresponds (cf. Dk 8.17) to one group of the Avestan categories (*ōšmurišn*). A parallel passage is given in the first fragard of the *S[ti]ūdgār* Nask, Dk 9.2.19 (and elsewhere): *abar bazišn ī naskān ī 21 azāš fradom ud didīgar ud sadīgar gāh ī Ahunvar*, "about the division of the 21 Nasks: this is from the first, the second and the third *gāh-s* of the Ahunvar". Each Nask of the 21 Avestan Nask is belived to have been derived from a corresponding word of this prayer²². The sequence given in Dk 8.1.12 is as follows: *S[ti]ūdgār, Warštmanšr, Bag, Dāmdād, Nādar, Pājag, Raō.dāi.aētag, Bariš, Kaškisraw, Wištāsp.Sāst, Waštāg, Cīhrdād, Spand, Bagān Yašt, Nīkātūm, Duzd.sar.nījad, Hūspāram, Sakātūm, Vendīdād, Hāōxt, Stōd Yašt*, and this is the order in which the Nasks were summarized in Dk 8. However, the first *gāh* of the Ahunvar prayer, the model and the source of the Avesta, contains 8 words, the second has only 6, and the third one consists of 7 words.

Though it was the third *gāh* only (corresponding to the *Dādīg* group of the Avesta) that consists of 7 words, the only group given in the Avestan Canon as an unbroken sequence was the second one, the *Haðā.Mānōrīg* group, corresponding to the second *gāh* of only 6 words: *Dāmdād, Nādar, Pājag, Raō.dāi.aētag, Bariš, Kaškisraw, Wištāsp.Sāst*. The position of the last Nask, namely the *Wištāsp.Sāst*, was problematic, as it did not have a

corresponding word in the second *gāh* of the Ahunvar prayer, and this is why we can deduct (Dk 8.1.15) that one (of eight) word from the first *gāh* of the Ahunvar "delegated"²³ itself to the second *gāh*. We are told there that the linkage (*paywastan*) of *Waštāg*, an entirely lost part of the *Gāθā*, to the end of *Haðā.Mānōrīg*, i.e., after the *Haðā.Mānōric Wištāsp.Sāst*, "is because it is written in connection with *Wištāsp.Sāst*, the end of *Haðā.Mānōrīg*".

Traditionally (cf. West 1892, 25 n. 1), this *Waštāg* Nask, whose position is precisely in the middle of the collection of 21 Nasks, was taken to be corresponding to the eleventh, the middle, word of the Ahunvar, namely *manag hō*, which is found in the second *gāh*, i.e., in *gāh* of the *Haðā.Mānōric* group, and for this reason it was the eleventh Nask. However, it makes sense only according to the liturgical organization of the Nasks, as given in Dk 8.1.12.

Along the *gāh-s*, this *Waštāg* Nask must correspond to the fourth word of the Ahunvar, *aθā*, as it was the fourth *Gāθic* Nask, or to the "extra", the eighth, word of the first *gāh*, namely *hacā*, as it was certainly this word regarded to be "delegated" to the second *gāh*. It is not without interest to note that the phonetic forms of these words, *aθā* and *hacā*, resemble the word *Sāst* of the *Wištāsp.Sāst*²⁴. Another interesting trait about the *Haðā.Mānōric* group is that (Dk 8.1.10) there were no Nasks "made unto the *Haðā.Mānōrīg*", though it was exactly this group that "borrowed" a Nask, while there was stated (Dk 8.1.9 & 11) that Nasks existed "those made unto the *Gāθās*, and their names are those of the invocations of the *Gāθic* worship" and "those made unto the *Dād*, and their names are those of the *Dād*".

"Those made unto ...", or "assimilated", Nasks included the *Spand* Nask for the *Gāθīg* group, the fifth *Gāθīg* Nask, placed between the first and the second *Haðā.Mānōrīg* Nasks, while "those made unto ...", or "assimilated" to the *Dādīg* group were "those which are composed for the law with separate propitiations" (Dk 8.1.11), namely the Nasks *Cīhrdād* and *Bagān Yašt*, i.e., exactly the Nasks surrounding the *Gāθīg* *Spand* Nask.

23 The word for this being, perhaps, *paywastan*.

24 Alliteration and allusion to phonetic similarity as a method of interpretation was quite normal in Zoroastrian texts. Compare, e.g., Dk 8.4.2, dealing with the *Bag* Nask, where the word *kīrbag*, "merit", was provoked by the name of the *Bag* Nask: "Bag ī dahmān srūd" kū ō dahmān guft *ōstēd kū kē ēn kīrbag kunē āš ēn kīrbag kard bawēd*, "Bag of the community is renown", it is said about the community, meaning that whoever shall do a virtuous deed, a merit will be performed by him". In passing, it must be noted that this example demonstrates the pronunciation *Bag*, not *Bay*, as Cereti put it.

21 Sundermann published a Manichaean Middle Parthian fragment where Ahunwait *Gāh* Nask, i.e., the Ahunwaiti *Gāθā*, the first of the 5 Old Avestan Gathas, which begins with the Ahuna Vairia prayer, is mentioned, while an Old Sogdian version of the following Avestan text, the *Ašam Vohū* prayer, was published by Gershevitch 1976a.

22 Mani's and Mazdak's works were said to corresponded to the letters of the alphabet, too, cf. Shaki 1985.

In other words, in the middle of the collection stood Wištāsp.Sāst (Haðā.Mānōrīg), Waštāg (Gāθīg), Cīhrdād (Dādīg), Spand (Gāθīg), Bagān Yašt (Dādīg), i.e., the Nasks whose characteristics were seen as specific and containing elements of the group which is not their own²⁵, by means of what was designated as *mēhmānīh, "hosting"²⁶.

The reason why the only sequence given in a row in the Canon is that of the "ritualistic", the Haðā.Mānōrīg group, is that it is the ritual that makes communication possible between the world of thought and that of action, "Haðā.Mānōrīg being intermediary" (Dk 8.1.16). The Gāθic group is identified with the "ideal", mēnōgic, world, while the Law, the Dādīc group, belongs to gētīg, the world of action (*ibid.*). The mēnōg principle is seen as motivating and causing, through the ritual, and this is "the reason of the Hāðōxt and [Stōd] Yašt having been linked to Vendīdād, the last Dādīc Nask" (*ibid.*), i.e., at the very end of the Canon, returning to their "source". The ideal of Renovation was symbolized by placing the *Vendīdād Nask (*Hōm²⁷) close to the one but last (the Gāθic) Hāðōxt Nask, treating material similar to that of Vendīdād 19: "the linkage of the end of the Dād, which is *Hōm, again to the Gāθā, which is the source, is the symbol of the primal mēnōgīh which was the pure Gāθānīg functioning; at the end it will be even gētīg; and as it was obtained from mēnōg, it descended again to the linkage of mēnōg" (Dk 8.1.17).

25 Cf. Dk 8.1.13: "in all three (divisions) all three are (found): in the Gāθīg are the Haðā.Mānōrīg and Dādīg, in the Haðā.Mānōrīg are the Gāθīg and Dādīg, in the Dādīg are the Gāθānīg (Bagān Yašt) and Haðā.Mānōrīg (Cīhrdād)".

26 Dk 8.1.14: jud jud hān ī xvad mādiyānīhā ud mādagwarīhā mēhmānīg, ud hān ī dīd.bahrīg andar āwur mēhmānīg, "each separately hosts, especially [or: textually?] and essentially, its own, and (also) hosts that which was brought into from other parts". The notion of "hosting" is important also in Dk 8.46.3-4, cf. further. The precise meaning of the word mādiyān (I believe this transcription is more accurate than MacKenzie's mādayān, judging from the form in Old Georgian and Armenian) in the headings of Dk 8 poses problems, as it can be translated as "text, book", or "essence, basis, particulars" etc., cf. MacKenzie, 1971, 53. This Middle Iranian word produced (*mātāgdān > mātiyān, cf. Bielmeier 1985, 35) Old Georgian maṭiane, maṭiani, "Annalen", Armenian matean, "book". In my translation, I generally render mādiyān as "particulars", but the translation "book, text" is possible as well, in almost all the contexts.

27 Written Hīm in Pāzand, and so transliterated and translated by Molé and Cereti; however, West 1892, 8 and n. 4), rightly emended to Hōm. The shift u (and o) to *i was typical for Zoroastrian Persian of Fārs and is a commonplace in MSs, especially in Pāzand, as here. Compare *ahū* in Dk 8.46.2, written *ahū*, notes West 1892, 170 n. 1, "as usual in Iran".

Thus, the Nasks were grouped together into three, according to their "types":

Gāθānīg	Hāðō[k].Mānōrīg	Dādīg
1. Stōd Yašt	1. Dāmād	1. Nikātūm
2. Sītūdgar	2. Nādar	2. Duzd.sar.nijad
3. Warštāmsār	3. Pājag	3. Hūspāram
4. Bag	4. Raṭō.dāṭ.aētag	4. Sakātūm
5. Waštāg	5. Bariš	5. Vendīdād
6. Hāðōxt	6. Kaškīsrāw	6. Cīhrdād
7. Spand	7. Wištāsp.Sāst	7. Bagān Yašt.

Another sequence is believed to correspond to the 21 words of the Ahunvar prayer and may have astrological connotations (cf. Gignoux 1996a, 288a); the List of the Nasks according to their order in Dk 8 is as follows:

1. Sītūdgar
2. Warštāmsār
3. Bag
4. Dāmād
5. Nādar
6. Pājag
7. Raṭō.dāṭ.aētag
8. Bariš
9. Kaškīsrāw
10. Wištāsp.Sāst
11. Waštāg
12. Cīhrdād
13. Spand
14. Bagān Yašt
15. Nikātūm
16. Duzd.sar.nijad
17. Hūspāram
18. Sakātūm
19. Vendīdād
20. Hāðōxt
21. Stōd Yašt.

This sequence is identical with the correspondence between the 21 Nasks and the 21 words of the Ahunvar prayer as given in the New Persian Rivāyat of Bahman Punjya (cf. Unvālā 1922, I, 3-4; Cereti 1997, 100 n. 37): az riwāyat-i Bahman Punjya nām-i 21 nask az iṣṭā ahu vairyo: yaθā: Studkar, ahū: vahišta mantra, vairiio: Baq, aθā: Dāmdād, ratuš: Nādur, aṣṭā: Pāzun, ciṭ: Ratoštāyid, hacā: Bariš, vaṇhōuš: Kušasrub, dazdā: Gōštāspād, managhō: Dād, šīaoθananām: Cidrašat, aθhōuš: Spanta, mazdāi: Bayān Yašt, xšaθramca: Niyadām, ahurāt: Dwasarwajid, ā: Huspārām, yim: Sakadām, drigubliō: Juddiwdād, dadat: Hādoxt, vāstārem: Yašt.

However, the order given by other Rivāyats is different (cf. below). The three first Gathic Nasks analyzed in Dk 9 are commentaries on the three great prayers, Ahunvar, Aṣām Vohū, Yēghē hātām. The first two Nasks are mythical or historical, while the third is a kind of meditation, serving as a gloss on the whole text²⁸.

The S[t]ūdgār Nask, whose name means "causing beneficence" [or, "praise"] and which is summarized in one-third of Dk 9 (Ch.2-23), takes only a few lines in DkM 680 (Dk 8.2; West 1892, 10-11). We possess a rather complete concept of its contents from Dk 9, but the summary in Dk 8 is so vague that it would be impossible to comprehend how Dk 8.2 is connected to the text summarized in Dk 9.2-23 in case the summary in Dk 9 were lost. This situation is illustrative perhaps for the whole of the Avestan Nasks.

However, Dk 8.2.2b, "and about abstaining/defense from the law of the evil and the people most causing to adversary", may refer to Dk 9.5, 9, 10 etc.; according to West, Dk 8.2.3-4 refer to Dk 9.5, 9, 10 etc. and to Dk 9.23.7. Obviously, this is too foggy, as the ideas expressed in Dk 8.2.3-4 are a commonplace of Zoroastrian literature. Dk 8.2.4 seems to be a distorted rendering of an unidentifiable Avestan passage. The translation remains purely tentative.

The closing *mantra*, ahlāyih ābādih pahlom hast, "righteousness is perfect excellence", first met with here, closes, in different combinations, all of the chapters of Dk 8-9. This is the Pahlavi version of the Aṣām Vohū prayer [APPENDIX III]²⁹. As the purpose of this closing formula is magic, it will be left untranslated.

²⁸ Cf. Gignoux 1996a, 288a.

²⁹ A similar formula, obviously, a calque from our Zoroastrian one, exists also in Mandæan.

The Warštmanšār, whose name means "Manthra-Effect"³⁰, contained 23 fragards and is summarized in Dk 9.24-46. In Dk 8, as in Dk 9 and Bahman Punjya Rivāyat, it is the second Nask, while mentioned as the third in other Rivāyats. It corresponds to the second word, ahū, of the Ahunvar prayer, whence the reference to ahūyih in § 2. References to Dk 9.24-5, where some close parallels are found, will be dealt with somewhere else. If we remember that the only firm reference in Dk 8.2 is to Dk 9.23, one might think that the summarizing work of Dk 8.2-3 was made rather at random.

The *Zand* of the Warštmanšār Nask is, so to speak, a philological one, while the S[t]ūdgār Nask is of a rather associative and *midrashic* character. This is referred to in §§ 2-3.

The Bag Nask is considered as either the third or the fourth Nask, corresponding to the word *vairyo* of the Ahunvar prayer, its name meaning "divisions"; according to Skjærvø 1989a, 400b, the Bag of Bag Nask refers to the word *bayā* ("part, piece"; "divine prayer", Pahlavi *baxtarh*, "distributorship") found in the final verses of all three of the opening prayers, while the word *Bagān* is, indeed, the plural of "god". Its 22 fragards summarized in the third part of Dk 9, chapters 47-68; some contents of this Nask will be dealt with in Chapter III, though not at such a length as those of the S[t]ūdgār and Warštmanšār Nasks. From its 21 (PR) or 22 (Dk) fragards, the first three are still extant as Y 19-21; these Yasnas are a commentary on the prayers Yaθā ahū vairiio (Ahuna vairiia, Ahunvar), Aṣām Vohū, and Yēghē hātām. These three Yasnas (called in the MSs *Bagān Yašt*, not *Bag Nask*) are only ones in the entire extant Avesta which represent a kind of an Avestan commentary on an Avestan text, not yet fully interpreted; they were compared (Kellens 1989a, 38; Skjærvø 1989a, 400b) to Sāyaṇa's Sanskrit commentary on the Veda.

The rest of the Bag Nask, now lost, contained a commentary, in Avestan, as it seems, on the Gāθās and on the prayer *Ahrīšmānā iṣiio*; thus, it is the opening part of the Nask which we still possess, and the central and the closing parts which are lost. Of the three prayers, the first two are said to be the words of Ahura Mazdā, but the third one was uttered by Zoroaster,

³⁰ Note the similar idea expressed in the name of S[t]ūdgār Nask, which probably means "Praise-Work."

addressing to the Aməša Spəntas. The Ahunvar was created by Ahura Mazda before anything else in the world (Y 19.1-4), but after the Aməša Spəntas (Y 19.8).

The Ahunvar commentary consists of 21 paragraphs, according to the number of its words and to the number of the Nasks as well, while the two other prayers are commented in only 5 paragraphs each. Y 19.8 contains expressions like *vacō yaī ahumai yaī ratumai*, "the utterance containing the words *ahu* and *ratu*", Y 21.4: *uštātāt*, "being *uštāt*", using nominal derivation (cf. Skjærvø 1989a, 400b), so typical for later Pahlavi Zands. *kārāiia-* means "to point to, to *refer to" (AIW 448), and *cinasti*, *para.cinasti* mean "to assign"³¹, indicating the commentary character of the text.

This Bag Nask³², which belongs to the Gāθānīg group, now almost totally lost, must be discriminated from the Bagān Yašt³³/Nask (which belonged to the Dādīg group), summarized in Dk 8.15³⁴ (cf. below). It is important to stress that the texts used in the liturgy, except the Gāθās proper, belonged to the non-Gāθānīg Nasks.

The Dāmdād Nask (Dk 8.5) is the first of the "ritualistic" Haθā.Mānōric Nasks; it was set as the fourth Nask by the account in Dk 8.1 (where it immediately follows the three Gāθic Nasks, summarized in Dk 9) and by the Bahman Pūnjya Rivāyat, and as the fifth Nask by the Kāma Bohra Rivāyat. The name is derived from the traditional "learned" rendering of Avestan *dāmi.dāti, "the creating of the creation", or, rather, from the Pahlavi phrase *dām dād*, "he (Ohrmazd) created"³⁵. The name of this, the first of the "ritualistic" Haθā.Mānōric group, Nask, is, in any case, rather close in meaning to the name of the first of the Dādīc group, namely the Cīhrdād Nask³⁶.

31 Cf. Narten 1975, 86ff.; Humbach 1984, 54: "to refer"; in my translation of the Pahlavi version: "to teach" in the sense of "to ascribe", "to assign".

32 Cf. Dk 8.1.9, Dk 8.4, Dk 9.47-68, Persian Rivāyats (translated in West 1892, 418-47; not repeated in Dhabhar 1932, 4).

33 Cereti 1997, 105: Bayān *Yasn.

34 There are many quotations from the Pahlavi version of the Yašts in Dk and other texts, e.g., Yt 13.107 in DkS 14.51-52, §§ 11-12, p.48 §5, Yt 13.97, Dk 7.3.42-46, 10.2, 7.50, Yt 19.78-81, 92-3, 11. In many cases they are from the Yašts for which we have no extant Pahlavi version, thus they are the only remnants of such a version. It would be an important task to assemble these quotations.

35 Cf. MacKenzie 1993b.

36 Cf. West 1892, 25 n.2.

The Cīhrdād Nask, whose name means "Creation of Seed" or "Creation of Classes", tended to enumerate and classify things; however, the first element of both names could easily be interpreted as "creature", or the like, as all the seeds and all the classes and sorts are created.

The contents of both Nasks seem also to have been not without parallels. So, it is the Dāmdād Nask (Dk 8.5.3), not the Cīhrdād Nask, that spoke of *stt ud tōhmaq ud sraxtaq ud cīhr* ud *kār*, "the classes and sorts (of the creation and their) being and seed and parts, nature and task". Both Nasks treated creation ("creatorship and the creation of the best creation", Dk 8.5.1; creation of "Gayōmard, the First Man" etc., Dk 8.12.1), but it appears that it was rather the Dāmdād Nask, than the Cīhrdād Nask, that stressed the *mēnōg* / *gētīg* speculation, which surely had taken considerable space in the Dāmdād Nask. It would be, of course, an exaggeration to state that most of the occurrences of the *mēnōg* / *gētīg* idea in Pahlavi texts go back to this Nask; what is interesting here is the mention of "visible form" (*ō paydāgīnast ī kerbtīh*), which could be another term for *gētīg*, appearing also in the short account of the Cīhrdād Nask (Dk 8.12.1).

The Dāmdād Nask treated more the earlier stages of the eschatological drama of the Zoroastrian myth, exposing the Creation as a means "formed and made for the battle against the Assault (of the Evil)", while the Cīhrdād Nask stressed more the apocalyptic, final, dimensions of the drama. As both are interwoven in Zoroastrianism, the Dāmdād Nask treated also "the reason for ... creation and ... final fate", "the manner and means of overcoming and destroying it (the Evil), and saving and freeing creation from it". Similarly, the Cīhrdād Nask treated some of the same contents, but on a lesser scale, as we can judge from the extracts found in Dk 8. As a whole, the "ritualistic" character of the Dāmdād Nask can be seen in its tendency to re-tell the "classical" Zoroastrian version of the basic myth (probably, in the form similar to that found in the Bundahīšn); but laws are subjected to changes, and the "legalistic" Cīhrdād Nask chose to update its contents with new, Sasanian, material.

The name of the lost Nask summarized in Dk 8.6 is uncertain; it was read *Waxtar or *Waxtwar ("time, destiny, fate") in West 1892, 15 n. 1, or as Nādar (i.e., Nādar), being the traditional name, in West 1892, 15; *Naxtar (from *Indic *nakṣatra-*, "Gestirne") in Tavadia 1956, 59 (cf. Molé 1963, 65), adopted as Nāxtar in Cereti 1997, 98, 102, 110; the reading generally accepted now is Nātar or Nādar.

The Nask, being the second of the Haðā.Mānōric Nasks, corresponds to the fifth, ratuš, word of the Ahunvar in the Bahman Pūnĵya Rivāyat, consequently the sixth Nask in other Rivāyats. According to the Rivāyats, it consisted of 35 compilations (šūrats) on astronomy and astrology.

If Tavadia is right, and the name of the Nask is the evidence of its ultimately Indian origin, it must have been composed/translated about the time when the Avesta was codified under Husraw II, at the end of the 6th century. This was, indeed, a period of massive import of Indian ideas and wisdom. Kāltīah and Dīmnah, Tūtī Nāmāh, Sīndbād Nāmāh were translated from Indic into Pahlavi about 550. Some other short Pahlavi treatises are of Indian origin or reveal Indian themes, first of all, "Chess"³⁷.

Adaptations of Indian material included treatises on "Logic" (Tark, cf. de Menasce 1949, 1-3), "Time-counting" (gōwīšn ī hangām šnāsag; Kōšāk is Sanskrit kośa, kāla kōśā[k], ("Zeitrechnungssammlung"), "Grammar" (ʔbyʔkrn, avyākaran is vyākaraṇa), "Horoscopy" (*Hōrā, Greek ὥρα, "hour" > Indic), while Kālakriyā is a branch of planetary astronomy. Transmitted via Sasanian Iran, Indian motifs reached Greece and Syria³⁸.

However, one could hardly believe that at such a late date some scientific material would have been written in Avestan and, moreover, it is impossible that the Avestan text, on astronomy and astrology (!), could survive up to the ninth century, while its Pahlavi version was lost about the time when Dk 8 was composed.

One tends rather to think that this text was *not* dealing with scientific matters; the original Avestan text was still in use, while the Zand was lost, thus testifying the loss of parts of the Pahlavi Avesta. The expressions cāšīšn šmurišn, "teaching, study", do not necessarily imply study of theoretical matters, but intend rather learning of how to recite the text, as it was used for ʔzišn, "worship". It is worth comparing the wording of the summary of this Nask now lost with what was stated about another Nask, which also is not extant anymore, namely the Waštāg Nask (Dk 8.12):

Waštāg Abistāg ud Zand pad dastwar ō amāh nē paywast.

Compare:

Nādar Zand ō amāh rāy nē paywast Abistāg cīyōn pad dastwarh.

37 Wizārišn ī Catrang, Jamasp-Asana, 1897, I, 115-120. Cf. also Perry 1959; de Blois 1990 and de Blois 1993a; on Indian in Dk (summarized mostly in DkM 428, IV.99-100), cf. Bailey 1943, 86; de Menasce 1949, 1-3; Tavadia 1956, 70.

38 Cf. Shaked 1984, 49-50.

The formulas in use are paywastan, "to hand over, transmit" (ō amāh [rāy], "to us"), pad dastwar[īh], "through authority (of a dastwar)". It seems that the reliance was rather on oral than on written tradition. If we refer briefly again to the question about the contents of the lost Nādar Nask, the next Nask, Pājag Nask, the third Nask of the Haðā.Mānōric group, gives us some insight how little we can, sometimes, rely on the contents of the Nasks as summarized.

Sometimes, the summary refers to the initial portion only, and omits the following portions. Thus, the summary of the Pājag Nask (Dk 8.7) begins with sheep-slaughter³⁹, and only towards the end of the summary we learn that this Nask contained what we could classify as time-reckoning material. Should we possess only the first paragraphs, we would conclude it was mostly ritualistic⁴⁰; should we possess only the paragraphs of the middle portions, we would conclude it was mostly calendaric⁴¹. To some degree it apply also to the Hāðōxt Nask as summarized in Dk 8.45, while we possess parts of the Nask in both original Avestan and in Pahlavi outside the Dēnkard⁴². West 1904, 88, commented on this problem:

"... there is nothing in the [Dēnkard 8] description of the Hāðōxt Nask that applies to "the fate of the soul after death" which is the subject of the two other sections; though it must be admitted that the last 121 sections of the Nask are hardly described at all in the Dēnkard".

Several passages of Dk 8.7 contain valuable information about religious life in Late Sasanian Iran. Thus, Dk 8.7.13 suggests that some religious teaching took place during the Gāhānbār festivals; Dk 8.7.18-19 refers to public observances of Zoroastrian religious duties imposed on people suspected, as it seems, of apostasy or heresy.

Though (Dk 8.7.19) pad rōšnkarīh az Yazdān kadām dād, "what is the law of God as the elucidation (is concerned)", can be translated also otherwise (e.g., "which one of the Gods was created for elucidation [to treat him in case of doubt]", or the like), nevertheless, the context,

39 On some aspects of this, cf. de Menasce 1947a, 231.

40 It is indeed the third or the fourth Haðā.Mānōric Nask, and many scholars, indeed, rendered Haðā.Mānōr- as "ritual[istic]". I use here "ritualistic" in a stricter sense.

41 The same might be true for the Nādar Nask, as well, though this is rather a speculation.

42 Cf. Haug & West 1872, 267-316 [Haug's "Appendix II, The Three Fargards of the Hāðōxt Nask which are still extant, The Zand and Pahlavi Texts, with a transliteration of the Pahlavi, and various readings (Westergaard's Yasht Fragments XX. 1-XX.36)"].

especially that of Dk 8.7.18, may suggest that in Late Sasanian Iran there existed an office, called *rōškarān*, "elucidation", which was, actually, some kind of Zoroastrian, so to speak, inquisition. This suggestion is not impossible, judging from what we know about persecutions of Christians, Manichaeans, Mazdakites and others about the time when the Sasanian Canon was finally established.

What is especially interesting about this Nask survivals of which can be found in legalistic books, is the fact that it should have been containing Sasanian additions⁴³. This fact is of historical importance, as it demonstrates, once again, that the Late Sasanian Avesta was a compilation made of, partly, recent materials.

*Ratō.dāi.aētag*⁴⁴, the fourth *Haḏā.Mānōric* ("legalistic") Nask, was the seventh (or, the eighth) Nask of the Sasanian Avesta. Its name means something like "concerning the habits of a priestly master", according to West 1902, 19 n. 4, and indeed, its contents have some close similarities with those of the *Erbedestān* Nask as summarized in Dk 8.28⁴⁵.

In this Nask, some place [Dk 8.2] was dedicated to characteristics of the leader of the *rad* (*ratu*)-priestly guild [rad.pēšag-sālār], what is only natural in the Nask whose name includes the word *ratu*. It was stated (*ibid.*) that it possessed "portion[s] [bahr] of other authority [patīh], even of the lordship [x^vadāyaz]", thus implying the pretension of the priestly leader to get also some secular, even, perhaps, royal authority. This text could be dated by an epoch during which the Iranian power extended also beyond what was traditionally seen as Iran proper, namely *x^vanīrah* (*ibid.*: "*rad*-office of *x^vanīrah* [radīh ī *x^vanīrah*] and other continents [kišwar]"). The rest of the Nask was dedicated to the ritual proper.

43 Which was shown, from the calendar, in Nyberg 1934 and Boyce 1970.

44 *ltwšt'yty*. Cereti 1997, 103: *Radwīšāiti*.

45 E.g., compare Dk 28.8.9 (*Erbedestān*; cf. Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 21-2): *abar frazīh ī āθrō'an, ēwag az did, pad dānišn.abzār, ud paymānag ī frazīh kē patīhsazāqtārīh ī ēwag az did pad patīh bawēd*, "About the superiority of one priest to another in knowledge and skills and the definition of the superiority which constitutes greater worthiness of one compared with another", and Dk 8.8.2 (*Ratō.dāi.aētag*): *cim ī sazāqth ud sazāqtārīh pad rad.pēšag-sālār, abārtīg patīh x^vadāyaz bahr x^vēšīh, kū cīyōn be wīzārīšn sazāqth az sazāqth ud sazāqtārīh az [alsazāqth] padaš...*, "The reason of the worthiness and superiority in leader of the *rad*-priestly guild, and his possession of portion[s] of other authority, even of the lordship; it is, how worthiness should be discriminated from unworthiness in him, and superiority from unworthiness...".

The now lost *Barīš*⁴⁶ Nask, the 5th *Haḏā.Mānōric* Nask, the 8th or the 9th one in the lists, "contained matters concerning almost everything between heaven and earth"⁴⁷. It was also noted that "no extant Avestan texts or fragments have been identified"⁴⁸. However, it was perhaps one of the sources of *Mēnōg ī Xrad*, and some of the "Tahmuras Fragments" (=Pursišnīhā) and Avestan quotations in the Pahlavi *Vendīdād* [=Wīdēw dād] could be taken from this Nask⁴⁹, its Pahlavi version being perhaps the base of Dk 6 and other *Andarz*⁵⁰ texts. Dk 6, edited in Shaked 1979, belongs mostly to the same genre as the lost *Barīš* Nask⁵¹; the *paymān* idea in Dk 8.9, being Iranian, reveals, nevertheless, some awareness of the Aristotelian ethics⁵².

The 6th *Haḏā.Mānōrtīg* Nask, called *Kaškīsrāw*, the 9th or the 10th in the lists, is briefly summarized in Dk 8. 10; West 1892, 23 n.1, saw the name of this Nask as containing the word *sraw*, "statement", etc., and was probably right. Though the Nask is summarized in only 6 lines (DKM), it is possible to reconstruct its character: the contents of this Nask seem to be similar to *Yašt*s and to apocalyptic compositions based on them, especially to ZWY. This Nask was characterized by interest in the proper performance of the ritual and in the Last Days; ZWY, the typical apocalyptic text, also shares (ZWY 5-7) this interest in ritual, and this trait of the relevant passages of ZWY and our Nask could be regarded as having common sources. This Nask contained some astrological (*daxšag ud nīšān*, cf. also ZWY 7.6) predictions⁵³. The notion of *abar rēzišnīh*, "overflowing"⁵⁴, derives perhaps from a lost Pahlavi version of *Yt* 8 (cf. *Yt* 8.211ff.).

The evil produced by demons and others (*dēwān ... ud abārīg*), at different times in the future, is predicted, but the faithful ones are promised complete annihilation of their enemies (*ī.šān hanjābišn*) and the final triumph of *Yazdān*; the usage of this word, instead of **Ohrmazd ud Amahraspandān*, e.g., is due perhaps to the *Yašt* source. It is implied that the worship must be carried out with faith and special set of mind, *pāhrēz*, lest it be turned into

46 The meaning of the name of the *Barīš* Nask is unknown, it can also be read *brēh*, "fate, destiny", as Molé 1963 did.

47 Skjærvø 1989b.

48 *Ibid.*

49 Darmesteter 1892-93, III, xv-xvii.

50 Compare Cunakova 1991, 11.

51 Cf. also Gignoux 1996a, 286b.

52 Shaked 1979, XLff.

53 Cf. Panaino 1995, 102, *et passim*.

54 I follow West in reading and translating this word.

daēva-worship. The reference to "spiritual sās̥ts (doctrines)" in Dk 8.10.3 might be an allusion to the name of the next Nask, namely the Wištāsp Sāst.

The Wištāsp Sāst, the tenth (or, in other versions, the eleventh) Nask, was of mythical-historical character, though being the last "ritualistic", Haōmā.Mānōric, Nask, and the Waštāg Nask was said to be connected to it; however, we know nothing about this particular Nask (cf. Dk 8.12).

There was a tendency to confuse the Nask Wištāsp Sāst with Yt 24, the Wištāsp Yašt (cf. Molé 1963, 373), and Cereti 1997, 104, read the name of the Nask as "Wištāsp * Yašt", stating (*ibid.*, 110) that it had contained Aīrēn ī Paygambār ī Zardu(x)št and Wištāsp Yašt.

In principle, there can be no such a thing as a Yašt dedicated to a king⁵⁵; the Yašts are dedicated to Iranian gods of old, to Yazatas, introduced by Zoroaster, to Ahura Mazda, but, nevertheless, we do possess a Wištāsp Yašt. This Yašt, called Yt 24, is generally linked to Yt 23, Aīrēn ī Paygambār ī Zardu(x)št; the two texts are frequently taken as a single composition, "Yt 23-24" (cf. Darmesteter 1884, 328-347), with Pahlavi versions available for both. In fact, under the name of Wištāsp Yašt the second part of Yt 23 is known. Sometimes, this text (the Wištāsp Yašt) is called Yt 24, sometimes the Wištāsp Yašt and the first part of Yt 23, i.e., Yt 23 proper, the Aīrēn ī Paygambār ī Zardu(x)št, are seen as Yt 23-24⁵⁶.

The Avestan Wištāsp Yašt (Yt 24) has nothing to do with the rest of the Yašt collection⁵⁷, as its contents are rather [pseudo-]historical than liturgical and it was not dedicated to a divinity; it is a recent compilation, grammatically corrupt and compiled from different sources⁵⁸, probably in the Parthian or Sasanian epoch. It is obvious, both from the corrupt and late Avestan of the Yašt in question, and from the mere fact of existence of such a strange Yašt,

55 But compare Kayān Yašt, another name of the Zamyād Yašt.

56 Similarly, the second part (Yt 1.23-33, cf. Darmesteter 1884, 31-34; Kanga 1941, 1-23, 105) of the Ohrmazd Yašt (Yt 1.1-23, cf. Darmesteter 1884, 21-31) got the name of Wahman Yašt, and sometimes this text was known also as Yt 2.

57 For this reason the Avestan original was excluded by Geldner from his edition of the Yašts, cf. also Geldner 1904, 9.

58 Cf. Geldner 1904, 9.

whose place inside the Yašt collection was always questioned (the uncertain place: Yt 23.b or Yt 24), that this composition is of a secondary and a late character.

The Pahlavi Wištāsp Yašt (5200 words) is, however, in Old Pahlavi, and, taking into account the archaic character of the language of the Pahlavi version and the late character of the language of the Avestan version, it could be suggested that both versions should go back to the same (or, to a close) period. The extant text is of Iranian origin⁵⁹, preceded by an Avestan-Pahlavi introduction, consisting of four formulas⁶⁰.

The fact that its Pahlavi version was, nevertheless, preserved, indicates the importance ascribed to this text. One could probably call this Yašt a Zoroastrian apocryphon⁶¹, but it is the link between the Yašt and its Pahlavi version and the Nask Wištāsp Sāst that suggests that Avestan texts were still composed at a relatively late date; in some cases, they were probably translated from Pahlavi.

There is some correspondence between the order of the Yašts and the order of the days of a Zoroastrian month⁶². As Hartman has noted, in several cases the name of a Yašt has nothing - or, very little - to do with its contents, and was given on the basis of the calendaric sequence.

It seems that this is the reason why the second part of Ohrmazd Yašt (Yt 1) got the name Wahman Yašt: the 1st day of the month is Ohrmazd, the 2nd being Wahman; contrary to the view expressed formerly by Gignoux⁶³, a // the Immortal Bountiful Ones were supposed to have a special Yašt⁶⁴. In this respect, it is worth reminder that the 23rd day is Day pad Dēn, while the 24th day is Dēn (both containing the word for "Religion"), corresponding, respectively, to the Aīrēn ī Paygambār ī Zardu(x)št and Wištāsp Yašt, whose contents tell the sacred story of the acceptance of the Religion by Zoroaster and, later, by his royal patron Wištāsp.

59 On specific corruptions, cf. West 1904, 86.

60 Published in Westergaard 1852-54, 485; cf. Darmesteter 1884, 328-347; the Pahlavi version of the Wištāsp Yašt in Molé 1963, 348ff., transliterated & translated; cf. also West 1904, 86; Kanga 1941, 105-8.

61 Another apocryphon is the Vaēθa Nask, first edited in Kotwal 1966, F.M., Bombay (*non vid!*), newly edited by Humbach & JamaspAsa 1993, taken in Boyce 1968, 66 n. 2, to be a 18th-century forgery.

62 Cf. Geldner 1904, 7; Hartman 1955; Hartman 1956; on the Yašt divinities and the STRōzag, cf. Wikander 1946, 229ff.

63 Cf. Gignoux 1985-8; Gignoux 1986a; Gignoux 1986b; but compare now Gignoux 1996b.

64 Cf. Geldner 1904, 7 n. 1, where Anquetil Duperron's remarks are quoted.

The Wištāsp Sāst Nask consisted, according to the Rivāyats, of 60 *kardahs*, of which only ten, or eight, survived after Alexander. Already West 1892, 24 n. 4, realized that the eight *fragards* of the Wištāsp Yašt were meant. This is how the confusion between both texts was caused.

This was, of course, a mistake on the part of the redactors of the Rivāyat (cf. Molé, *ibid.*), as the *Nask* Wištāsp Sāst was hardly identical with the Yašt, which must be a part of another Nask, namely the Stōd Yašt Nask.

As Molé, *ibid.*, noted, it is not impossible that the Wištāsp Yašt was a liturgic adaptation of some contents of the Wištāsp Sāst. Molé 1963, 349, noted that WZs 24.5-6 retelling of the conversion⁶⁵ was based on the version of the Spand Nask, while the Pahlavi Rivāyats (PRDD 47) used the version of the Wištāsp Sāst. The Zoroastrian New Persian Zaratušt Nāmāh goes back, according to his view, directly to the Sasanian Avesta, and not to either version.

It is questionable whether Ayādgār ī Zarērān, a Pahlavi adaptation of a Parthian royal epic telling the story of what followed after Wištāsp's conversion, consists of some *Zands* of the Frawardīn Yašt or was somehow connected to the Wištāsp Sāst. This conversion, on the contrary, was not mentioned in the Wištāsp Yašt, neither in its Avestan, nor in the Pahlavi versions⁶⁶, but is one of the major themes of Dk 7⁶⁷.

As the resumé of the Wištāsp Sāst given in Dk 8.11 has all the essentials characteristic of Dk 7, not corresponding to the contents of the Wištāsp Yašt but vaguely, Molé 1963, 282, rightly concluded that Wištāsp Yašt and Wištāsp Sāst are not identical, and it was the second (perhaps, together with some material added from the Spand Nask) that was retold in Dk 7. However, here the question arises why a particular Nask was summarized at such a length (perhaps, even was preserved in its entirety) in one of the Dēnkard books, without saying that implicitly? Or, why the version of Dk 8.11 does not tell us that this Nask was already summarized in the book (i.e., Dk 7), whose end is separated only few folios from Dk 8.11?

So, there are several possibilities: 1) the Nask was summarized in Dk 8.11 not in its entire form; 2) what we know now as Yt 24 (probably, together with Yt 23) is merely remnants of the much longer Nask (it was the view of the authors of the Rivāyats); 3) Dk 7 was heavily based on the Nask, while Yt 24 was not part of it. As was probably felt from my treatment given above, I opt for the third possibility.

Though of historical-mythical character, the Cīhrdād Nask was listed as a Dādic Nask, put between two Gāētic Nasks, namely the Wastag and Spand Nasks. It was the first Dādic Nask, the 11th or the 12th Nask in the lists; however, its position among the Dādic Nasks was of "those made [or, "assimilated"] unto the Dād" (cf. Dk 8.1.11). According to Skjærvø 1989b, it was possibly in error of the second element of its name (as dād could be interpreted as both "creat-", etc., and "law, legal"), but it was said (Dk 8.1.11), together with Bagān.Yašt, to be "composed for the Law with separate propitiation" (pad jud šnōmanīh). The original name was perhaps *čīrō.dāti, "the establishment of the origins"⁶⁸, as stated in Dk 8.12.5: "the establishment of the Law and of customs: that of farming, for the tilling and fostering of the world .. and that of ruling, for the protection and organization of the creation...", or in Dk 8.12.20: "about the primal creation of crafts, arts, and the proper functions of the ages".

This indicates that much space was dedicated to sanctify the existing social order, with its division of the society into strictly-defined and rigid hereditary classes. Some division of the historical drama of salvation was probably implied ("the proper functions of the ages", *ibid.*). In should be noted here in passing that Iranian "ages" (šahr⁶⁹, or, here, x^vadayih) were actually periods of rule of a certain monarch, and thus eschatological notions could be easily introduced, though the material seems to be generally old⁷⁰.

Actually, this Nask contained a history of Mankind, being, to some degree, a priestly prototype of the Book of Kings. Materials taken from it could be traced to Bundahišn and other later compositions. It must be one of the most popular Nask and it is strange indeed that it did not survive in its entirety.

⁶⁵ Among the texts dealing with the conversion of Wištāsp are PRDD 47, WD, pp. 26-49, fragments in Dk 5 and Dk 7, edited and translated in Molé 1967.

⁶⁶ Williams 1990, II, 213.

⁶⁷ Edited in Molé 1967.

⁶⁸ Skjærvø, *ibid.*; compare a similar statement in West 1892, 25 n. 2.

⁶⁹ On the temporal aspect of the word, especially, in the Achaemenian period, cf. Gnoli 1980, 62ff.

⁷⁰ As West 1892, 30 n. 3, has observed, §§ 1-16 draw upon Avestan, including now non-extant, sources, while 11 17-19 are undeniably Sasanian.

Together with Dk 8.12.9 & 15, where Turanians and Arabs are implicitly mentioned (cf. also *ib.*, § 17: "and many families..."), § 3, which states that "each race being specifically accounted for... messengers (sent by the Creator) to each separate race", possibly indicates that the Nask included material relating to the history of non-Iranians (Greeks, Jews, Indians and others), as seen from a Sasanian perspective.

It is interesting that the Creator sent messengers *also* to them, thus provoking in one's mind an analogy with pre-Islamic prophets known only from the Koran, or Mani's famous statement about his forerunners Buddha, Zoroaster and Jesus, sent to their respective countries. The anti-Jewish polemics in the *Dēnkard*⁷¹, and also parts of the polemics against non-Zoroastrians in the *ŠGW*, were, I suppose, derived from this Nask. It seems that the interaction with other religious systems of the Eastern Mediterranean, especially, after Christianity established itself as the state-religion of Byzantium (which corresponds to the Sasanian period in Iran) played a considerable rôle in the Zoroastrian agenda. The problems posed by the "Western" religions were dealt with in an ingenious way, and it is of great interest, I think, that several genres⁷² known in Jewish literature of the Late Antiquity find their parallels in what we know about one of the Gāōic Nasks, namely in the Spand Nask, which follows immediately the Cīhrdād Nask. It cannot be implied here, of course, that Jewish literature of the age, whether in its written or in its oral form, had made an impact of some weight on Middle Persian Zoroastrian writings, but these remarkable similarities of genres and motifs must be seen as representing both the *Zeitgeist* and some built-in structural closeness of both religious traditions.

Dk 8.14.5 refers to "the bestowal of other Nasks through these 7 questions, through speaking out (*paδ frāz.gōwīšn*Th) of each place of the conference". This probably implies that the Nasks were produced by a few words pronounced at the conferences, but are not a literal reproduction of what was said, thus the Nasks being a product of emanation. The original words pronounced at the conferences were, thus, completely *mēnōg*.

⁷¹ Cf. Shaked 1990a, with earlier bibliography listed.

⁷² The similarities in structures of Jewish and Zoroastrian *halakha* were noted a long time ago. The topic of *halakhic* material as such is beyond the scope of this work, and thus will be not discussed here.

A discrepancy could be seen here: as the 21 words of the Ahunvar generated the whole of the Avesta, i.e., the 21 Nasks, the words pronounced at the 7 conferences generated "other Nasks" (seven? twenty one?). In any case, this view contradicts with particulars of the tradition about the Ahunvar, though being identical at the core. In Dk 8.14.7-9 the notion is that the Complete Wisdom enabled Zoroaster to possess a text that can generate and reproduce itself, revealing more and more new layers⁷³.

It would be only natural that the Nask telling Zoroaster's, so to say, "pre-history" (*stf*⁷⁴), his birth and his encounters with Ōhrmazd was treated as "mythical assimilated to gāōic" (cf. Molé 1963, 276). By form, it was, actually, a composition similar to some types of Jewish *miq rāšīm* and *ʾaggādōt*, re-telling, with embellishments and oddly additions, the scriptural story.

This particular Nask, if I read into it correctly, contained perceptions picturing Zoroaster's encounter with Those Who Revealed him his Vision (*daēnā*) in a way we find in the Jewish *Hēkālōt* literature⁷⁵; it was the Immortal Bountiful One *s* rather than Ōhrmazd Himself who revealed and showed things to Zoroaster (Dk 8.14.6), as in the Jewish texts in question where the Revealer is an angel, not God; the position (*ibid.*) of the Immortal Bountiful One *s* (seven in number) at the occasion of each question (seven in number) seems to have a special cultic-mythic significance whose meaning, however, evaded me. This point could be important for Molé's reconstruction in his "Culte, Mythe et Cosmologie", but he had translated the words *frašn frašn hangām ī nīšast ud xʷāst ī har jār ud ēwēnag ī nīšastan ī Amahrspandān* ("the time of sitting down and rising up at the occasion of each question, and the manner of the sitting of the Immortal Bountiful One *s*") as "*la date des différentes discussions, leur ouverture et leur levée; comment chaque fois les Amahrspand s'y sont placés*", taking *nīšast ud xʷāst* as indicating the beginning and the end of each encounter; this translation ignores the importance of *ēwēnag ī nīšastan ī Amahrspandān*, "the manner of the

⁷³ This seems to be a very "[post-]modern" view, though similar notions are known from other mystic traditions, e.g., from some Jewish circles where Zohar was studied. This book, composed in Aramaic, was attributed traditionally to R. Shimon Bar-Yochay (the 2nd century), having been divinely revealed to him. Modern scholarship (cf., e.g., Scholem 1965) sees Moshe de Leon, who lived 1000 years later in Spain, as the author or redactor. The tradition, however, was not shaken by this discovery, and many Qabbalists, i.e., traditional scholars of the Zohar, of our own times see no basic contradiction between the revelation given to R. Bar-Yochay and the "authorship" of Moshe de Leon, which they do not deny.

⁷⁴ The word means "not just 'existence'", cf. Shaked 1971, 93.

⁷⁵ Greenfield 1973 and Alexander 1983 still remain, probably, the best introductions. On some parallels between the Zoroastrian and Jewish visions, cf. Shaked 1996a [Hebrew].

sitting of the Immortal Bountiful One s" / "comment chaque fois les Amahraspand s'y sont placés"⁷⁶.

Moreover, frāz madan ī Zardu(x)št ō hān handēmānīh ud gāh īš hān gyāg, "(the manner of) Zoroaster's coming forth into their presence, his position in every place", with its handēmānīh, implies something like a royal audience, while gāh īš, "his position (in every place)", indicated perhaps that Zoroaster was sitting on a throne during his conferences (gāh can be rendered also this way⁷⁷). The same concept of righteous ones sitting on thrones is probably expressed in Dk.8.14.8 (gāh ī mīzd ī ahlawān, pādag pādag ciyōnāšān arjānīgīh ī pad kirbag warzīdārīh, "the reward-throne of the righteous ones, grades of position according to their worthiness through performance of good deeds"; nevertheless, here "place of reward" is also possible).

However, parallels could be found in AWN⁷⁸ 7.2-3 [1-2]:

ud dīdam hān ī ahlawān ruwān kē.šān ciyōn star ī rōzag rōšnīh azəš hamē
waxšīd ū.šān gāh ud nīšast abēr rōšn ud borz ud purr.x^v arrah būd,

"and I saw the souls of the righteous ones, from whom a radiance like a shining star was ever kindled, and their thrones and seats were above the light, lofty and full of glory";

ibid., 9.3 [2]:

hān ī ahlawān pad gāh ud wistard ī Zarrēn.kard,

"the righteous on thrones and carpets made of gold";

many other examples can be easily added.

76 That Molé's translation is inadequate on this point, can be shown from the Ra[đ.dā].aētag Nask, Dk 8.8.3: abar nīmāyīšn ud āgāhīnišn ī nīšast ud brahmag ī Amahraspandān..., "about the demonstration and acknowledgment of the sitting and the (ritual) manner of the Bountiful Immortals...".

77 Old Persian gāθu-, "throne, place"; Avestan gātu-, Middle Persian & Parthian gāh, "throne, place, rank"; Arabic jāh, "rank, honour", Armenian gah, "throne, seat, rank"; New Persian gāh, gāh, "throne, place"; Middle Persian gāhūg, "throne, bier", Pashto ḡālai, ḡālai, "place", Sogdian ḡāhūk, ḡw šk, "throne", Yaghnobi ḡōtk, "nest", cf. de Blois 1993b. Sasanian kings were sitting before God[s] in their fire temples on a *dēn-gāhūg (for Arabic dybk'hw), cf. Tafazzoli 1988. This practice must be relevant for the Dēnkard passage in question. For the usage of gāh, "throne", in contexts of death/seeing the presence of God, cf. Schmeja 1982.

78 For editions, cf. Haug & West 1872; Gignoux 1984a; Vahman 1986. The translation here is mine.

Other elements of the Spand Nask included Zoroaster's consuming (frāz burdan⁷⁹) of the Complete Wisdom and his vision of the future things; the episode alluded to is the same described in ZWY 1 & 3 and some other secondary sources; it is the wording of ZWY 3.7-9 that enables us to provide a better reading of the Dēnkard text and to divide Dk 8.14.7-8 in a more comprehensive way.

Later on, here comes the vision of Paradise and Hell; in the Jewish Hēkālōt literature, this is an indispensable element of a vision once the revealing angel or God Himself was encountered by a visionary. On the Iranian side, we possess, of course, AWN where the visions of Paradise and Hell are shown to the visionary, but there is no introducing vision there (AWN 11.4-8 seems not to belong to the original composition, as it is at odds with AWN 101.3 [1]), where we are told that:

....ō hān asar rōšnīh ud hanjoman ī Ohrmazd ud Amahrspandān burd,

"...he [angel] carried me into the endless light, the assembly of Ohrmazd and the Immortal Bountiful One s".

Then, Ohrmazd speaks (101.7-8 []):

cē man abāg hēm kē Ohrmazd hēm har hān ī drust ud rāst gōwēd man
šnāsom ud dānom, be gōw ō dānāgān,

"...for I, who Am Ohrmazd, Am with *thee⁸⁰. Everyone who speaks correctly and truly, I recognize and know, so (thus) say to the wise",

and then, AWN 101.10-11 (6), Ardā Wtrāz finds out that:

ud ka Ohrmazd pad ēn ēwēnag guft man skoft be mānd hēm cēm rōšnīh did
ūm tan nē dīd ūm wāng ššnūd ūm dānist kū ēn hast Ohrmazd,

"and when Ohrmazd spoke in this manner, I remained astonished, for I saw a light, but I saw no body; I also heard a voice, and I understood that this is Ohrmazd".

79 frāz x^vardān in ZWY 3.7-8.

80 Cf. Haug & West 1872, 203; Gignoux 1984a, 215; Vahman 1986, 218.

All these elements have their exact correspondents in the Hēkādī literature, but these parallels will be studied elsewhere⁸¹. Elevation, present in the Jewish versions, is absent from AWN and the Spand Nask, but was present with Mani⁸² and Kerdēr⁸³. The question, nevertheless, arises about the nature of the relationship between AWN and the Spand Nask.

Was Zoroaster's vision not enough? Was AWN modelled on the Spand Nask? Was it felt, at a certain period of time, that the vision of Zoroaster was just too remote in time to serve as consolation and to remove doubts about the fate of the righteous Zoroastrian's soul in the afterlife?

"Many marvels ... revealed by him (Zoroaster) through it (the conferences), such as these, assembled together and selected, mentioned in the Dēnkard-scripture" (Dk 8.14.4) seems to be a reference to Dk 7. There are, indeed, many particular similarities, especially in the structure of the text, between Dk 7 (Dk 7.1 must be noted) and Dk 8.14, but there are motifs uncommon to both texts. Above all, the scarcity of the material provided by Dk 8.14 disables us from drawing any far-fetched conclusions.

As Molé 1963, 279, has observed, "...les différences entre les deux textes ne sont pas négligeables et prouvent que le récit du septième livre ne suit pas exactement celui du Spand". Dk 7 clearly drew upon also from Wīstāsp Sāst and Cīhrdād Nask.

On the other hand, AWN and ZWY owed a great deal of their contents to the Spand Nask, not necessarily directly. This seems to be the problem with some of the lost Nasks, such as Cīhrdād or Spand: we possess an exposition of their contents, we do have as well longer texts which pretend not to be extensions of these Nask, but which do contain material derived from these Nasks (I mean Bundahīšn and other sources, including xVadāy Nāmag, as derived, presumably, from the Cīhrdād Nask, and Dēnkard 7, as derived, presumably, from the

81 Among those, the mention of water of the lake of the moist/blue wood, AWN 10.8-11 (7-8): hān war ī āb ī ēzm ī xVēd ... war ī wuzurg ī āb ī kabōd. The notion that Ohrmazd could not be seen, though containing nothing non-Zoroastrian (but compare the Sasanian reliefs), nonetheless, causes one to ponder on a Judaeo-Christian setting (compare Shaked 1996a).

82 Cf. Müller 1904b, 86-88; Boyce 1975b, text e, 34-7; 8Trūnī in Aḇāru-ī-Bāqiyah, Sachau 1879, 191, informs us that Mānī performed levitation: "the king Sāhpuhr came to believe in him when he had ascended with him towards heaven, and they had been standing in the air between heaven and earth. Mānī, thereby, made him witness a miracle. Besides, they relate that he sometimes used to rise to heaven from among his companions, to stay there for some days, and then to redescend to them".

83 Cf. e.g., Gignoux 1981; Gignoux 1984b; Gignoux 1991b; Russell 1990. The literature on the subject is vast and cannot be cited here.

Spand Nask), though the material is not overlapping. One possible explanation may be that our brief expositions of the contents of the Nasks are not that sufficient, as we would like to admit. The other possible explanation would be that the texts derived from the Nasks and identified by us as such, also include much interpolated material. The Zoroastrian perception of self-reproduction of texts generated by the primal encounter enabled Zandists to produce more and more Zands.

However, the interest in the figure of the founder of the Iranian national religion seems to be part and parcel of the intellectual climate of the epoch that we count as "Sasanian": it was an epoch when many founded religions widespread in Iran, like Buddhism, Manichæism, Judaism, Christianity, all of which venerated, to different degrees, their respective founders. The question whether the figure of Zoroaster inspired the veneration of Mani, Jesus, Buddha and Moses, or vice versa, cannot be answered, but there is little doubt that these phenomena are interrelated.

The name of Bag[ān] Yašt/Nask is confusing, as in the Dēnkard it applies to the Yašts collection (or, parts of it), with the word Bagān being the plural of "god" (while the Bag of Bag Nask refers to the word bāyā ("part, piece"; "divine prayer"; or "division"?).

Bagān Yašt is used as the name of the last one of the Dādīg, "legalistic", Nasks, of the Avesta, and as the name of Yasna 19-21 in MSs (which seems to be a blunder, cf. above). It is Dādīg, legal, while the Stōd Yašt, of a similarly liturgic character, is Gāθānīg (cf. Molé 1963, 66). In the Dēnkard, Bagān Yašt stands for Yašt or Yasn, Persian Rivāyats have Bagān Yašt and Bayān Yašt.

Dk 8.15 contained a description of Ahura Mazda, "highest of all the gods", *wisp [MSs: yst:] bayān abardom, "and the remaining visible and invisible gods in the world"; abārtīg a.paydāg ud paydāg stīhān⁸⁴ az Yāzdān.

This does not contradict with the general order of the extant Yašts collection, which places the Ohrmazd Yašt first on order⁸⁵ (note also, that the Bagān ("gods") Yašt corresponds to the 14th word of the Ahunvar prayer, namely to māzdaī). It is generally assumed that at least some of the known Yašts plus the Hōm Yašt, Y 9-11 and the Srōš Yašt, Y 57, belonged to

84 Skjærvø 1989c: gēlīgān.

85 Due to the calendaric sequence. It seems that this is the reason why the second part of the Ohrmazd Yašt got the name Wahman Yašt: the 1st day of the month is Ohrmazd, the 2nd being Wahman, cf. Chapter IV.

this Nask, while the core of the Yasna belonged to the Stōd Yašt (Skjærvø 1989c⁸⁶). According to Dhabhar 1963, iii-iv, the present Yašts constitute a part of this Bagān Yašt Nask.

According to the Persian Rivāyats (Dhabhar 1932, 4)⁸⁷, it had 17 sections, while one Rivāyat enumerates 16 Yašts (the 19 known Yašts less Yt 2, 3, 6, cf. West 1892, xlv n.1, Darmesteter 1893, II, xxvi-xxviii)⁸⁸.

The old Yašt MS F numbers the last six Yašts, Yt 14-19 as Yt 11-16, based perhaps upon an old tradition. A few quotations from the Bagān Yašt not found in the Yašt collection may have been survived, cf. West 1892, 470-1.

The Bagān Yašt treated the veneration of the 30 divinities presiding on the 30 days of each month⁸⁹: aoxtō.nāmanō Yazata, guft.nām Yazad, cf. Dk 8.15.2. On this basis, it must have been contained of 30 units (as a month has 30 days), organized as separate Yašts. The two Strōzags, the Great and the Small ones (edited in Dehdaštī 1363h.š.), are organized according the same principle.

Bailey 1943, 161, emended to *Bagān an unreadable word in a Pahlavi text (Abdīh ī Sagestān⁹⁰, 15) dealing with the history of the Avesta:

...nask ēw būd. <abāg> zanān būd aburnāyag ēw nask ēw ī *Bayānaz *
xʷānēnd warm kard ēstād,

"there was a Nask kept with women and called *Bayān, memorized by a youth".

⁸⁶ Cf. also Josephson 1997, 23 n. 57.

⁸⁷ Persian Rivāyats in West 1892, 418, 426, 431, 436; cf. Molé 1963, 66.

⁸⁸ Actually, there are 24 texts in Avestan known as Yašts, plus the second part of Yt 1, known as Wahman Yašt, thus total 25 Yašts.

⁸⁹ There is some correspondence between the order of the Yašts and the order of the days of a Zoroastrian month (cf. Geldner 1904, 7; Hartman 1955; *ib.*, 1956; on the Yašt divinities and the Strōzag, cf. Wikander 1946, 229ff.). As Hartman has noted, in several cases the name of a Yašt has nothing - or, very little - to do with its contents, and was given on the basis of the calendaric sequence.

⁹⁰ Cf. West 1916; Bailey 1943, 161; Tavadian 1956, 141; Boyce 1968, 62-3; Utas 1976.

The emendation was seen as quite hypothetical in Skjærvø 1989c, 406. However, this emendation seems to me to be pretty plausible and convincing⁹¹: memorizing liturgic texts, of "pagan" provenance, for everyday use, in simple Young Avestan (after all, this is the character of the Yašt collection), with no theological depth, but with many frequently repeating formulas, fits well women and children, as the Pahlavi text put it.

Given what we know of the present poor preservation of the Yašt collection, which has Pahlavi versions for only a few Yašts (Pahlavi versions exist only for Yašt 1, Yašt 3, Yašt 9, Yašt 11, Yašt 14, Yašt 20, Yašt 23), and bearing in mind the "Stānīc theory" forwarded in Gnoli's works⁹², one could, with right, to speculate that this *Bayān Nask preserved only in Sagestān / Sīstān was perhaps the whole of the original Yašt collection with its Pahlavi version, or parts of it, what is called Bagān Yašt in the Dēnkard summary.

The Dk 8 chapters that follow Dk 8.15 consist of chapters summarizing the lost Nasks: Dk 8.16-20 (Nikāṭūm Nask, the first Dādīg Nask); Dk 8.21-27 (Duzd.sar.nijad Nask, the second Dādīg Nask); Dk 8.28-37 (Hūspāram Nask, the third Dādīg Nask); Dk 8.38-43 (Sakāṭūm Nask, the fourth Dādīg Nask); Dk 8.44 (Vendīdād [Jud.đēw.đād / Widēwdād] Nask), the fifth Dādīg Nask); Dk 8.45 (Hāōōxt Nask, the sixth Gāōānīg Nask); Dk 8.46 (Stōd Yašt Nask, the second Gāōānīg Nask).

The Nikāṭūm Nask, Duzd.sar.nijad Nask, Hūspāram Nask, Sakāṭūm Nask were legalistic in the strict sense of the word; nothing, eventually, survived from the Nikāṭūm Nask, Duzd.sar.nijad Nask and Sakāṭūm Nask, except the summary found in Dk 8; only few passages were edited by various scholars (Dk 8.26 was edited and translated in Tafazzoli 1995b); as these three Nasks have no specific bearing on the theme of this work, they will be edited and translated elsewhere, while treating legal stuff.

As to the Hūspāram Nask, the third Dādīg Nask, the Vendīdād Nask, the fifth Dādīg Nask, and the Hāōōxt Nask, the sixth Gāōānīg Nask, we are in a happy position as we possess, partly or completely, three Avestan Nasks of a rather representative for the so-called "Sasanian Avesta" character, with their respective Pahlavi versions, and the Dēnkard's accounts about them.

⁹¹ However, I can think of an alternative emendation, good both graphically and conceptually: the "ritualistic" *pāijag* Nask, as it consisting of gāns and Strōzags.

⁹² Cf. Gnoli 1967; *ibid.* 1975; *ibid.* 1980.

The three are, of course, the two sections of the 17th (or, 18th) Nask Hūspāram, namely Erbedestān, Nērangestān, and the 19th (or, 20th) Nask, namely the Vendīdād (Jud.dēw.dād/Widēwdād) Nask. Both Hūspāram and Vendīdād Nasks belong to the same, "legalistic", Haḍā.Mānōric group. Comparing their Avestan and both Pahlavi versions, the long ones (their *Zand* proper) and the short ones (the Dēnkard's accounts), we can make some deductions about what other, non-extant, Nasks were like.

Among the three texts, this is only the Vendīdād Nask that we possess in its completeness. The two other texts, the Erbedestān [Hērbēdistān, Erbedistān, etc.] and Nērangestān [Nīrangistān, Nērangistān, etc.], are only two of the thirty⁹³ sections of the Hūspāram Nask.

Dk 8.28 and 8.29 summarize the Erbedestān and Nērangestān fragards of the Hūspāram Nask respectively. The full text of the Erbedestān, first edited in Sanjana 1894 (folios 1-27, the first 18 fragments of the Nērangestān, contain an incomplete text of the Erbedestān, then the Nērangestān follows), was translated in Bulsara 1915, without the original texts; Darmesteter 1893, III, 78-148, and, later, Waag 1941, translated the Avestan and the immediate Middle Persian; the full text of Erbedestān was translated in Humbach 1990 (reviewed in Kreyenbroek 1991); another translation and edition is that by Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992 [with contributions by J. R. Russell] (reviewed in MacKenzie 1993a and Macuch 1995).

The Erbedestān seems to be the first fragard of the Hūspāram Nask, which corresponds to the 17th word, ā, of the Ahunvar, being the 17th Nask in *all* the Rivāyats. According to Humbach 1990, 9, the existing text, which is very corrupt, represents notes taken down by a student from an oral lecture, started from Avesta quotations; in the Erbedestān it is clearly seen that the text in question was an oral *Zand*; the question is why we do not possess any other, less idiosyncratic, variant of a written *Zand*.

For the text of the Dēnkard account (Dk 8.28) of the Erbedestān, cf. DkM 734.4ff., DkS XVI.11, 16-8; it was translated in West 1892, 92-4 and transliterated and translated in Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 21-2; it is the latter transliteration and translation that is reproduced here:

1. Hūspāram 30 burīnag ēw Erbedestān, mādigān abar kū ō Erbedestān kardan, kē zāyīšn. ciyōn hān ka šudan frēzwānīg, ud ciyōn hān ka pad x^vēš estēd ciyōn hān ka šudan nē padixšāy ud wizīn ī abar ērbad ud paymānag ī āθrō ī pahlom ud hān ī miyānag ud hān ī nidom pad abar.ōšmurišnīh ī ahlawān.xrad

2. ud abar āθrō ī frēstag, ud rāhēn.jāmag ud abzār⁹⁴ ī awiš dahīšn.

3. abar hān ī hāwišt pad tarsāgah andar ērbad, hān ī pad padtrīftan wācag, cāšīdan ī ō hāwišt.kunišn, andarz ī ērbad ō āθrō.ān, dranjinīdan⁹⁵ ī sraw nasāyih hangām.

4. ud abar cē pad abāz.rasišnīh āθrō ō deh kē azəš frēstīd deh.sardār ud dehīgān, āθrō rāy, āθrō ō deh kē azəš pad cāšīšn ammōzišn ī andar deh kunišn.

5. ud abar 5 xēm ī āθrō rāy kodām ōšmurdan ī āθrō fradom az srawān pad padisār tā hān abdom stāyīšn ī Yazad sraw cē andar ham dar.

6. abar darīhā kē āθrō(g) ī nihān.zāyīšn azəš x^vāhišn, pēšīh ud pasīh ham dar.

7. abar puhr ī āθrōg ī andar wināh.kārīh jud.fragard.

8. ud abar āθrōg kē Erbedestān kardan rāy hu.cēnag az deh stānēnd pad kardan sūdag bawēd.

9. abar frāzīh ī āθrō.ān, ēwag az did, pad dānīšn.abzār, ud paymānag ī frāzīh kē *patīh* sazāg.tarīh ī ēwag az did pad *patīh* bawēd, cē andar ham dar.

94 Here jāmag and abzār are synonymous, "tools". However, the translation of Kotwal & Kreyenbroek is retained.

95 In Arabic and Syriac sources the corresponding term is *zamzama*, *riḥnā*, cf. Greenfield 1974.

93 Sixty, according to the Persian Rivāyats.

"The Hōspāram Nask has 30 sections, one of which is the Erbedestān⁹⁶.

1. Chiefly about who should go to do religious studies; in which cases it is obligatory to go, in which cases it is up to oneself, and in which cases it is not permissible to go. And (about) the choice concerning a hērbēd, and the definition of the foremost priest, the middle one, and the last one, as regards the study of the wisdom of the righteous.
2. And about the arrangements for the priest who is sent (to study): the clothes and the resources to be given him.
3. About the student who shows reverence towards his master; the fact that he (i.e., the master should) accept him and teach him the Word, and makes him his student; and (about) the master's advice to the priests, and the recitation of the (sacred) formulæ, and (his instruction regarding) times of pollution.
4. And about the return of the priest to the region from which he was sent: the leader and the people of the region should make him offer teaching and instruction in the region.
5. About the five characteristics of the priest. Which of the sacred formulæ the priest will have studied first up to the final utterances of praise [i.e., the formula of the Law] and whatever belongs to this subject.
6. About the various subjects on which there should be questioning and demands between priest and faithful, and a whole range of points concerning this subject.
7. About the son of a priest who culpably misrecites.
8. And about a priest who accepts the expenses for pursuing religious studies from the region, but is negligent in pursuing them.
9. About the superiority of one priest to another in knowledge and skills; and the definition of the superiority which constitutes greater worthiness of one compared with another, and whatever belongs to this subject".

96 The name of the composition was differently translated, cf. Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 15.

Here follow⁹⁷ contents of some of the chapters of the extant Erbedestān that, in my opinion, the compiler of Dk 8.28 bore in mind:

Chapter 1. Who shall go to the advanced priestly studies. If one is responsible for the care of property, under what circumstances can one go?

Chapter 2. Continues this. Also: how far is it proper to travel?. The merit of pursuing religious studies vs. the need to take care of property. There are two asides concerning the nature of the Erbedestān (2.5) and the origin of *Zand* (2.10). The question of remuneration of the priestly teacher.

Chapter 3. How often, and for how long shall a man go to pursue religious studies? The proper time for travel is "three nights". Two different definitions of this concept are admissible.

Chapter 12. On the duration of priestly studies, and on those who are barred from them. On the wife and children of a man who comes to the faith. On the estate of a deceased foreigner who has accepted Zoroastrianism. On a woman who dies shortly after embracing Zoroastrianism. On relations between Zoroastrian men and non-Zoroastrian women. On non-Zoroastrians who come to Iran to seek refuge.

Chapter 13. On learning to recite the sacred texts.

Chapter 14-15. On teacher's responsibilities.

Chapter 18. On priestly teachers who are not good Zoroastrians.

Chapter 19. On teaching those who are not good Zoroastrians.

Chapter 20. On feeding a non-Zoroastrian.

This is of interest that we possess both in Avestan and in Pahlavi all the [short] texts frequently mentioned in Pahlavi texts: Erbedestān, Nērangestān, Bagān Yašt, Hāōxt Nask, Vendīdād. It seems that all these texts were maintained as parts of a curriculum of an average Sasanian lay letterate. In Xusraw ud Rōdag (cf. Unvala 1921, 13.8-10) we read:

pad hangām ō frahangistān dād hēm ud pad frahang kardan saxt ud awištāb būd hēm, ūm Yašt ī Hāōxt ud hān ī Yasn ud Wīdēwōd, hērbēdThā warm kard ud gyāg gyāg Zand niyō[x]šišn ēdād,

"And at the appropriate time I was sent to school, and I worked hard and applied myself to my education, and I memorized the Yašt ī Hāōxt⁹⁸, and that of Yasna, and the Vendīdād, like a hērbēd, and listened to all the passages of the *Zand*",

97 The translation adopted here is that given in Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 20-1.

98 On the meaning, cf. Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 17.

where *hērbēdīhā*, "like a herb", may somehow be an allusion to *Erbedestān*.

Although both *Erbedestān* and *Nērangestān* belonged to the same legalistic *Hūspāram* Nask, the *Erbedestān* was more interested with learning than the strictly *halakhic* and ritualistic *Nērangestān*. The interpretation of the extant Avestan-Pahlavi text of the *Nērangestān* is extremely difficult, and, unlike the *Erbedestān*, for which two modern editions are available, was not yet edited in a proper way⁹⁹, though two new editions of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts seem to be now in preparation, by Humbach and Kreyenbroek¹⁰⁰.

West 1904, 85-6, estimated the original *Nērangestān* in about 3200 Avestan and 6000 Pahlavi words in the text proper; 22000 Pahlavi words in the commentary, including 1800 of Avestan quotations, 3/4 from the liturgy. MS G contains *Nērangestān* where the last 7/8 corresponds exactly with the description of the first half of the *Nērangestān* section of the *Hūspāram* Nask as in the account about the Nasks from the Dk 8.29-1-7, West 1892, 94-96, and the previous part of the *Nērangestān* corresponds with some portions of the previous *Erbedestān* section of the same Nask, cf. West 1904, 86¹⁰¹.

"As this correspondence [of *Nērangestān* and *Erbedestān* texts with their extracts in Dk 8] is quite as close as that of the account of the *Vendīdād* in Dk. VIII with the *Vendīdād* itself, and the describer admits that his descriptions are based upon the Pahlavi versions only, it may be considered practically certain that the *Nērangestān* consists of two, or more, large fragments of the *Hūspāram* Nask with Pahlavi, nearly as it existed in Sasanian times", West 1904, 86.

The *Dēnkard* summary of this Nask was translated in West 1892, 92-4; edited and translated in Bailey 1933-5b, 277. The same priestly legalistic approach, similar in character to the latter Islamic *fiqh* works (as noted in Kreyenbroek 1991, 402), exists also in some other Zands, e.g. in the *Vendīdād*.

99 The Avestan text with notes on the Middle Persian version was published in Darmesteter 1893, 24, 78-148; the *Dēnkard* summary (Dk 8.29) was translated in West 1892, 94-96.

100 I was able to consult Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995 only after this work was finished.

101 The Avestan text with notes on the Pahlavi version was translated in Fragments of Le Zend-Avesta, cf. Darmesteter 1893, 24, 78-148; cf. Darmesteter 1895, 300; for the full, though obsolete, translation, cf. Bulsara 1915; the first fragard was edited and translated in Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995.

The other, now lost, unnumbered¹⁰² sections, were *Gōhrīgēstān*, "Transaction Code"¹⁰³ (now: *Hūspāram* 3; Dk 8.30; DkM 737.6-738.14; DkD 561.5-562.9; West 1892, 97-99); then, *Amēxtag*, "a miscellaneous section" (now: *Hūspāram* 4; Dk 8.31; DkM 738.15-743.10; DkD 268.10-missing folios 101.8; West 99-105); then, one section containing a single paragraph¹⁰⁴ (now: *Hūspāram* 5; Dk 8.32; DkM 743.11-13; DkD missing folios 101.8-10; West 1892, 105); then, a section of four short paragraphs¹⁰⁵ (now: *Hūspāram* 6; Dk 8.33; DkM 743.14-20; DkD missing folios 101.10-102.4; West 1892, 105-106); then, again, *Amēxtag*, "a miscellaneous section" (now: *Hūspāram* 7; Dk 8.34; DkM 743.21-745.22; DkD missing folios 102.4-105.13; West 1892, 106-108); then, another section (now: *Hūspāram* 8; Dk 8.35; DkM 746.1-748.3; Dk missing folios 105.13-109.12; West 1892, 109-112); then, "six fragards of one section of the (last) fourteen (sections)" (now: *Hūspāram* 9; Dk 8.36; DkM 748.4-749.7; DkD missing folios 109.12-111.13; West 1892, 112-114), then, "one section of the seven" at the end (now: *Hūspāram* 10; Dk 8.37; DkM 749.8-754.193; Dk missing folios 111.13-121.8; West 1892, 114-121).

102 Each section is described as "one section is ...", not "the third, fifth etc. section is ...".

103 Cereti 1997, 107: "Codice del Compenso".

104 20 brīnag ē mādiyān abar nērōg ī war.passaxtan ūš ēwēnagān ī bōxtan ud ēraxtan ī padēš ud cē andar ham dar, "One section of the 20 contains particulars about the power of ordeal trial, of passing and failing (through it), and whatever on the same subject".

105

1. brēnag ē abar ēwēnag ī sāmān ud band, abar stōr ud gōspand ud sag ī dēwānag ud

waxšīšn.kār ūšān wirāyišn tā cē paymānag. kā nē wirāst, σ ko[x]šīšn mad, pahrēz īšān andarēz band, cē andar ham dar.

2. ud abar wināh ī stōr ud gōspand ud sag kunēnd.

3. abar wināh ī nē wināhkār ōzadan.

4. abar pahrēz drāmān ī sag ī wlmār cē andar ham dar,

1. "One section about the mode of (putting) limits and bounds on a mad beast of burden, or cattle, or dog; and ..., and what could be the (sufficient) extent of their recovering (from their madness); and when they are not recovered and brought to liquidation, the care of them even in the bounds, and whatever on the same subject.

2. About the sin which a beast of burden, or cattle, or a dog could commit.

3. About the sin of killing an innocent person.

4. About the medicine care of a sick dog and whatever on the same subject".

The untranslated word in § 1, waxšīšn.kār, was rendered by West as "the operation of the affliction"; "work of rearing/growing" seems to an inadequate attempt to translate some agricultural term, unknown to us.

It must be stressed that only about a third of the sections of this Nask (if the total was 30, according to the Dēnkard version) were available for the compiler of Dk 8. Now, we possess even less, but still, with the Hūspāram texts we are in a happier position than with, say, the Sakālum or Nikālum texts. Another Pahlavi text, WZs 28.4, mentions a "Husbandry Code", Jordāg-Kāristān, clearly, a section of the Hūspāram Nask, missing in the Dēnkard account¹⁰⁶.

Other Hūspāram texts, though, probably, indeed, derived from some Avesta, whose contents are mostly legalistic in the stricter sense of the word, lie beyond the scope of my present work and will be edited on another opportunity. But two first sections of the Hūspāram Nask, namely Erbedestān and Nērangestān (though, too, containing mostly priestly legalistic traditions) were reported truthfully by the compiler[s] of Dk 8-9. Thus they serve as an evidence for the suggestion that some contents of some Avestan Nasks were well attested in their Pahlavi form.

The Vendīdād (Jud.dēw.dād/Widēwdād) Nask was summarized in Dk 8.44 (DkM 777.12-784.15; Dks XVI, 90-106; DkD 582.6-missing folios 133.6; West 1892, 152-166). Though its Dk and Zand versions are of greatest interest, it cannot be treated here and an edition of it will be suspended for a better opportunity. It must be only noted that the Dēnkard summary of the Vendīdād is extremely close to the original Nask (though there are several problems with some fragards seen as not belonging to the original Nask). The Vendīdād, the last, seventh, "legalistic" (Dādic) Nask, is the only one in the whole Sasanian Avesta that survived in its entirety and in a Pahlavi version. On the position of Vendīdād we are informed, however, in WZs 28.2 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 92-3), that "one is the Dād of the Jud-dēw, that is the Vendīdād, and one the Dād of Zoroaster, that is the other Dād (the other Dādīg Nasks)" [APPENDIX IV]. The date of this composition is uncertain, but it is clearly one of the most recent texts in Avestan¹⁰⁷.

¹⁰⁶ Jordāg-Kāristān kēš warzigarīh azāš paydāg, "Le Livre de Semaines par lequel est manifestée l'agriculture", cf. Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 92-3.

¹⁰⁷ About the middle of the second century BCE: Darmesteter 1893, III, xlviii, cf. 2, 259; Herzfeldt 1929-30, 79, n.1 & 136, n. 2; Bailey 1930-32b, 283.

This Nask corresponds to the nineteenth word of the Ahunvar prayer, drīgubīd, according to the Bahman Punjyā Rivāyat, but to the twentieth word, according to the other Rivāyats¹⁰⁸. Its Pahlavi version contains 48,000 words¹⁰⁹, including 400 Avestan quotations, while quite a few Avestan quotations are, in fact, from some other books¹¹⁰.

The Pahlavi version is astonishingly close to the Avestan source (though full of glosses and super-glosses), but this could be not true, as was noted¹¹¹, for Pahlavi Zands to other Nasks. Some fragards were summarized at length, while others, like Vd 17, e.g., were dismissed (in DkM 782.20) in one sentence:

abar pāhrēz ī war ud nāx'an ud wināh ī az a.pahrēzišnīh,

"about taking care of hair and nail and the sin of not taking care"¹¹².

Perhaps two fragards were not referred to in the version of Dk 8.44 at all, like Vd 10¹¹³, 12. However, as the PhIVd is a widely-studied text of considerable length, it was largely referred to; e.g., in DkM 241.16 / 415.18, the Zand of an Avestan text is comparable with Vd 19.28ff¹¹⁴.

Elements from other Nasks, now lost, were used by Vd glossators: two Nasks, namely Hūspāram and Nikālum, were quoted, together, in PhIVd 4.10¹¹⁵, 5.25, 15.22.

The three fragards of the Hāðōxt Nask which are still extant, in both Avestan and Pahlavi, were published and translated in Haug & West 1872, 267-316; originally, this Nask included 133 sections (brīnag), while the last 121 sections of the Nask are hardly described at all in the Dēnkard; unlike the cases of the Dēnkard summary of the Erbedestān and the

¹⁰⁸ Cf. West 1892, 152 n. 2, and Dhabhar 1932, 1-2.

¹⁰⁹ The so-called "Commentary on the Pahlavi Vendidad" (Zand ī Fragarad ī Jud.Dēw.Dād) in the Codex F, following the Rivāyats, contains about 27,000 words [West 1904, 106], thus, being 40 % less than PhIVd. Only 16 fragards were paraphrased (the fragards 1-2, 19-22 are missing), with extensive commentaries of about 17 commentators, nearly all of whom are mentioned in the Pahlavi Avesta. Thus, according to West, these fragards were not originally parts of the Vd. Later, this text (240 pages in MS TD2, pp.433-673) was printed in *The Iranian Codices and Researches* series, described in Jamasp-Asa 1970, 201 n. 1, cf. Jamasp-Asa 1981. An incomplete copy made for West is preserved in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, cf. de Menasce 1958a, 59. The text in question is, actually, a kind of Rivāyat, cf. Jamasp-Asa 1981, 317.

¹¹⁰ Cf. West 1904, 81.

¹¹¹ Geldner 1904, 17.

¹¹² A Pahlavi text edited in Jamasp-Asa 1981, might, in fact by a part of this lost fragard in its Zand version, rather than having been based on the plain Pahlavi Vendidad.

¹¹³ But cf. West 1892, 160 n. 11.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Bailey 1943, 117-8.

¹¹⁵ West 1904, 83, were a text and its translation is given, used Spiegel's chaptering.

Vendīdād, the contents of the Hāšōxt Nask as summarized in the Dēnkard reveal no closeness to the Hāšōxt Nask known to us from the three extant fragards: "there is nothing in the [Dk] description of the Hāšōxt Nask that applies to the "the fate of the soul after death" which is the subject of the two other [Dk] sections", as West 1904, 88, has noted.

The Nikāiūm (or, Nikādum, Nikādom, Nigāiōm) Nask was the third "legalistic" (Hāšā.Mānōric) Nask, the 15th (or, the 16th) Nask of the Sasanian Avesta. Two Nasks (Duzd.sar.nijad and Hūspāram/Huspāram) closer to the end of the list stood the Nask with a rhyming name, Sakāiūm, belonging to the same group. The Nikāiūm Nask included 30 sections, of which only 5 survived, namely Paykār Radestān, Zaxmestān, Rēšestān, Hamēmālestān, and a section of miscellanea. As this last "section" is the longest (more longer than the four "named" sections), it is not impossible to guess that it was, in fact, not a "section", properly speaking, but rather a summary of the rest of the 26 sections of the Nask. In this case, the Dk account would report *all* the summary of the Nask in their entirety. The summaries surviving in Dk 8 are as follows:

- 1) Dk 8.16; Nikāiūm 1; Paykār Radestān; DkM 693.2-695.5; DkD *missing folios* 83.1-97.2; West 1892, 35-39.
- 2) Dk 8.17; Nikāiūm 2; Zaxmestān; DkM 695.6-697.2; DkD *missing folios* 97.2-90.6; West 1892, 39-41.
- 3) Dk 8.18; Nikāiūm 3; Rēšestān; DkM 697.3-698.9; DkD *missing folios* 90.7-93.1; West 1892, 41-43.
- 4) Dk 8.19; Nikāiūm 4; Hamēmālestān; DkM 698.10-704.22; DkD *missing folios* 93.2-533.21; West 1892, 43-53.
- 5) Dk 8.20; Nikāiūm 5; DkM 705.1-720.22; DkD 297.22-293.22; West 1892, 53-74.

In Dk 8.21-27 the contents of the Duzd.sar.nijad Nask are summarized, whose name was interpreted by West (West 1892, 74 n.1) as "the thief's head downstricken". West, *ibid.*, also made a plausible suggestion that the "Nask was named from the contents of its first section, and possibly from its initial words". It included 18 sections, of which only "the first", "the second", "one of the (next) twelve", "the first of the (last) thirty-five", "the second", "the third", "the fourth" are summarized:

- 1) Dk 8.21; Duzd.sar.nijad 1; DkM 721.2-722.15; DkD 548.2-549.9; West 1892, 74-77.
- 2) Dk 8.22; Duzd.sar.nijad 2; Amēxtag; DkM 722.16-725.10; DkD 549.9-551.15; West 1892, 77-81.
- 3) Dk 8.23; Duzd.sar.nijad 3; Pasušhōwestān; DkM 725.11-728.4; DkD 551.15-553.19; West 1892, 81-84.
- 4) Dk 8.24; Duzd.sar.nijad 4; Stōrestān; DkM 728.5-729.6; DkD 553.20-554.18; West 1892, 84-86.
- 5) Dk 8.25; Duzd.sar.nijad 5; Arzestān; DkM 729.7-11; DkD 554.18-20; West 1892, 86.
- 6) Dk 8.26; Duzd.sar.nijad 6; Arteštārestān; DkM 729.12-732.12; DkD 554.22-557.12; West 1892, 86-90; Tafazzoli 1995.
- 7) Dk 8.27; Duzd.sar.nijad 7; Amēxtag; DkM 732.13-734.3; DkD 557.13-558.17; West 1892, 90-92.

The Sakāiūm (or, Sakādum, Sakādom, Sagāiōm) Nask was the sixth "legalistic" (Hāšā.Mānōric) Nask, the 18th (or, the 19th) Nask of the Sasanian Avesta. It included 30 sections, though other figures were given as well. The summaries surviving in Dk 8 are as follows:

- 1) Dk 8.38; Sakāiūm 1; DkM 754.20-761.21; DkD *missing folios* 121.9-8 569.3; West 1892, 121-130.
- 2) Dk 8.39; Sakāiūm 2; *Apēdagestān; DkM 771.11-772.8; DkD 577.2-18; West 131-136.
- 3) Dk 8.40; Sakāiūm 3; Ziyānagestān; DkM 766.3-21; DkD 572.13-573.6; West 1892, 136-7.
- 4) Dk 8.41; Sakāiūm 4; Waxšestān; DkM 767.1-771.10; DkD 573.7-577.2; West 1892, 138-143.
- 5) Dk 8.42; Sakāiūm 5; Warestān; DkM 771.11-772.8; DkD 577.2-18; West 144-5.
- 6) Dk 8.43; Sakāiūm 6; Amēxtag; DkM 772.9-777.11; DkD 577.18-582.5; West 1892, 145-152.

The last chapter of Dk 8, i.e., Dk 8.46, together with the first chapter of Dk 8, forms the frame for the whole book. This is a highly interesting though short text treating the principles of Gāōic exegesis.

The strange thing about it is that, unlike other chapters in Dk 8-9, it is impossible to tell wherefrom the text is derived: this is not a short summary, presumably of the Stōd Nask, the last, seventh, Gāōic Nask, but a comprehensive text, perhaps, *all* the text that was before the compiler's eyes. One cannot exclude, however, that *some Zand* of Ahunvar is meant. This short prayer was seen as a projection of the whole of the Gāōā, which itself is the whole of the Avesta.

According to Dk 8.1.9, 12.16, this Yašt Gāōān is identifiable with the Stōd Yašt. Dk 8.1.16 places the "Gāōic" Hāōxt Nask and the "Yašt" in the end of the Avestan Nasks, and the Yašt Gāōān, indeed, follows the Hāōxt Nask as the last chapter of the summary of the Nasks.

Molé 1963, 64, in West's footsteps¹¹⁶, defined Stōd Yašt as "*le text même des Gāthā, mais qui est à proprement parler un livre liturgique; c'est la partie centrale du Yasna*", having derived the title, Stōd Yašt, from Staota Yesnya, Y 14.59¹¹⁷.

According to Šāyast nē šāyast 13.1¹¹⁸, vīśāi ve amāšā spəntā in Y 14.1, is the beginning of the Stōdān Yasn¹¹⁹, while Y 58-59 ends mentioning the whole collection of the Stōd Yašt. According to West's (*ibid.*) deductions, the Stōd Yašt contained 32 hāts, as stated in the Rivāyats.

In the Bahman Pūnjya Rivāyat, the Yašt Gāōān corresponds to the 21st word of the Ahunvar, as seems to be the order also in the Dēnkard, but it is the first Nask, according to the other Rivāyats, a fact that is responsible to the change of numeration of all the other Nasks.

¹¹⁶ West 1892, 169 n. 1, identified Yašt Gāōān, Stōd Yašt / Yasl of the Rivāyats as the same text.

¹¹⁷ Note the interchange of -št / -sn.

¹¹⁸ As quoted in West 1892, 169 n. 1; not found in Tavadia 1930.

¹¹⁹ Cf. the previous note.

The synonymity of tōhmag and bun as words for "Religion, Avesta", on the one hand, and of tōhmag and zahag, on the other, is obvious in Dk 8.46.1. In a midrashic¹²⁰ way, interconnections link between different parts of the Word of God, and, as the next (Dk 8.46.2) paragraph clearly indicates, words connected by nothing but sound are considered as containing hints to some more profound mystic closeness, being emanating from the same source. Some aspects of that kind were studied by Martin Schwartz in three papers¹²¹, having based on Avestan sources only (with some Jewish parallels in Schwartz 1998), but, as far as I know, the Late Sasanian awareness of this phenomenon was not yet attested.

¹²⁰ Cf. Gignoux 1996a, 288a.

¹²¹ Cf. Schwartz 1986; 1989a; 1998.

CHAPTER II

The Way of Zand

The Gāthic texts, as is well known, exist in four Pahlavi versions:

1), the version of the "Pahlavi Yasna" (PY), i.e., the translation proper with some glosses and commentary remarks,

and the three versions of what is called "commentaries", namely, extracts from the Gāthic Nasks, summarized in Dk 9:

2), S[t]ūdgār Nask,

3), Warštānsār Nask,

4), Bag Nask.

We cannot be sure that we possess the versions summarized in Dk 9 in their complete and original forms. On the contrary, in many cases we do know that only a few excerpts have survived. Nevertheless, the comparison of the four versions might provide some important suggestions. Here two attempts are made to demonstrate how interwoven the four versions are. The first example is based on texts linked to Y 45, while the second example is based on texts linked to Y 51.

I

The exegesis of Y 45 (here only two stanzas of Y 45 will be analyzed, namely, Y 45.1 & 4, the translation adopted is that by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 73) [TEXT I] in the three Nasks summarized in Dk 9 reveals that there were three different attitudes, or veins, to read the Gathic text. Two of them, as signaled by the texts, are of some closeness each to the other and to the PY version [TEXT II]. The two versions are to be found in

1), Dk 9.38 (Warštānsār 15; DkM 854ff.; DkD 659ff.; DkS XVIII, 24ff.; English: West 1892, 273-6; French: Molé 1963, 329-331 *et passim*) [TEXT III] and

2), Dk 9.60 (Bag 14; DkM 921ff.; DkD 622ff.; DkS XIX, 51ff.; English: West 1882, 395-6 and West 1892, 364-6) [TEXT IV].

One, rather legalistic, attitude is represented by the Bag version (Dk 9.60), which was aiming the laymen, providing them the answers to their "why" and "how". It is of interest that Dk 9.60.1 refers to oral teaching to be listened to even by those generally not supposed to be permitted to be taught; perhaps, non-Zoroastrians are meant, while the allowance was attributed to the Prophet himself. The tendency of the Warštānsār Nask version (Dk 9.38) lies halfway from the version of the Pahlavi Yasna and the Bag version.

Though legalistic, it provides mystical commentary on the Yasna, supplying learned people with answers. It is this version which, in my opinion, was the most successful in grasping "the original meaning" of Zoroaster's words. The exegesis of the same Gāthā in the S[t]ūdgār Nask summarized in Dk 9.15 is of a different, mythological and allusive, character [TEXT V].

Y 45.1a is rendered not as grammatical imperative, but as a religious commandment; the curious points are:

1), dūm, which is a verbal pronominal ending, was interpreted as an independent word meaning "reflection" (thus implying that the root of dāhišn, "reflection" [cf. Shaked 1982b, 197ff.], Avestan *dāh-, "to teach", was not confused with that of dāhišn, "creation, gift" etc.; a derivate of this root, namely, dāhma-, "a learned person", was felt to be phonetically close to dūm);

2), aḥ frauuaxšiiā was rendered as a noun, frāz gōwišn, glossed [dēn], and sub-glossed gōš andar dārišn, where gōš is used as an alliteration to gōwišn, in PY 45.1, but as a verbal form, frāz gōwom, in PY 45.4;

3), PY 45.1b is a rather faithful rendering of the Avestan original; the change of the grammatical number and person took place in the Pahlavi text itself, as a result of overlapping of 3 Sng and 2 Pl in certain forms; the lexical equivalents are standard (īš, "to move, to approach", as "to seek, to wish"); the gloss to PY 45.1b stresses the need of religious teaching which will take an universalist twist in the Dk 9.38, which, indeed, could be found in this stanza;

4), in PY 45.1c, however, interesting deviations from the "original sense" of the Avestan line took place: unlike PY 45.1a, dūm was interpreted as from *dāt-; in the gloss, the Zandist used the word dām; probably, for him it sounded, as in vulgar New Persian, as *dūm; [vīspā] ciθrā was rightly interpreted as "manifestus", harwīsp paydāg, implying thus that the Zandist knew the original meaning of the word, and was not seduced to interpret it in the sense of a next-of-kin marriage; the glossator, however, with his dām, contaminated dūm and the "normal" sense of ciθrā / cihr, "creation / creature as race" (*Geschlecht*)¹; the most important point of deviance from the "original sense" is, however, the interpretation of the verbal form mazdāghō.dūm, "take (Pl) note!", in Y 45.1c as Ohrmazd dād, the reason for which is obvious (probably, also an echo of PY 45.4b);

¹ However, there existed a tradition that interpreted ciθrā in this sense, cf. Dk 9.60.3, dād pad cihr; another tradition, that of Dk 9.38.5, contaminated both with its zahagīg paydāgth.

5), in PY 45.1d, the general sense is rendered grammatically pretty well, while the setting was changed: the Gathic text refers most probably to Yima who lied one time, while the Pahlavi text assigns the rôle of liar to the Stinking Spirit (the same change took place also in the Persian National Epic) and projects it into the future, to the era of the Final Body;

6), in PY 45.1e, *hizuuā* understood as Instrumental (*pad uzwān*), while *akā varanā* and *draguuā* as Accusative (*hān ... wad.tar kāmāg ud hān ... druwandTh*); the root of the problematic *āuuaratō* was rightly identified, though the verbal form was taken as a causative verb *wurrdyēnēd*; the Stinking Spirit was supposed by the glossator to be the subject of the line.

PY 45.4 renders the Gathic text as referring to performing *xV ēdōdah*, the consanguinal next-of-kin marriage, though this is not implicitly mentioned in the stanza; moreover, the idea of right-mindedness, or piety (*armaiti*) being a female offspring of the creator (also, most probably [cf. further] unnamed) contains here no trace of anything anthropomorphic.

Nevertheless, the Pahlavi version stresses here the *xV ēdōdah*-point, making Spendarmat (*spenta armaiti*) the daughter, and the wife, too, of the creator; the Pahlavi version makes even Wahman here the Creator's son.

In PY 45.4a, the Accusative is rightly rendered, though the object in the Gāthā must be the Creator; the glossator makes the object the next-of-kin marriage.

In PY 45.4b one can see a very old layer of the Zand tradition:

az ahlāyīh āgāhīh Ohrmazd āgāh kē ēn dād

renders

ašāi hacā mazdā vaēda yā īm dāi,

where *mazdā* was translated twice, in the older layer as *āgāhīh* (cf. Wilkins Smith 1929, 117.42; Humbach and other took it as Vocative), with a later gloss, *Ohrmazd*, not recognized as such; the person of the verb *vaēda* was changed, with *Ohrmazd* becoming the subject.

In PY 45.4c, no grammatical forms were analyzed correctly; the "father of the abundant good thought" (the subject of the verb in Y 45.4a) was rendered as "and he (*Ohrmazd*) begot Wahman through fatherhood"; on the relationship between Avestan *varaz* and Pahlavi *warzīdan*, cf. Humbach 1991, II, 168. In other versions it (*warzīd*) corresponds to **dād*.

The gloss stresses the pious character of the next-of-kin marriage and its function as meritorious (and, in the version of Dk 9.60.3, "cherishing the creatures/nourishing the world"; Dk 9.38.5 used *wistarišnīgīh*, translated by me as "cherishing", in the similar way, being a Pahlavization of Avestan *vastr-*).

In the gloss to PY 45.1d, Spendarmat, explained as *bawandag.menišn*, a standard equivalent for *armaiti*, is praised for not desisting from performing the next-of-kin marriage with her father, *Ohrmazd*. This emphasis on the merits of the next-of-kin marriage clearly belongs to an epoch (a late epoch, it seems), when people were less eager to perform this custom than the "orthodox" would like to see them.

In PY 45.4e, one finds serious grammatical and conceptual deviation from the Gathic text: the Infinitive *nōit dibzaidiāi* was rendered by the Participle Perfect *nē frēft*, whose subject (in English) is Spendarmat (as is clear from the gloss "[who did not desist from performing *xV ēdōdah*]", not *Ohrmazd* as it should be; *vīspā.hišas*, "the all-seeing", Nominative, an epithet of *Ohrmazd* (*ahurō*), was taken as belonging to Spendarmat, *cē harwisp.nigērtār pad hān ī Ohrmazd*, "for (she is) the complete observer in what belongs to *Ohrmazd*", which is rather opaque; the not entirely clear gloss refers, however, to some functions of Spendarmat as sort of supervisor over the religious matters: [*kū pad Dēn ī Ohrmazd hamāg kār ud dadestān šh bawēd*, "[i.e., that so must be all the action and judgment in the Religion of *Ohrmazd*]").

Before turning now to the Dk 9.38 and Dk 9.60 versions, some points must be highlighted: Dk 9.60 explicitly states that the first creature of *Ohrmazd* were his children by the next-of-kin marriage, Wahman and Spendarmat; this has some significance in the context of Y 45.1, where Yima was probably referred to as the first man / first creature²; in the Pahlavi versions, there is no trace of Yima altogether; Dk 9.60.3, *cihr*, reflects *ciōrā* in Y 45.1c; "to teach", *cāštan*, in Dk 9.60.4-5, has some specific technical sense, something like "to experience"; the texts play all the time with *warzīdan* and *dahīšn*.

² Note that in Dk 3 (DkM 73.14-16) *Gayōmard* is said to be created by *Ohrmazd* from his daughter Spendarmat.

Dk 9.15 which pretends to be a S[ti]ūgar paraphrase of Y 45 has actually nothing in common with the contents of the Gāθā in question, but contains rather a mythical account of Keršāsp and Srōbar; the only reason why this myth was told there can be guessed from the end of the account (Dk 9.15.3-5) where Fire was referred to (on the "final function" of Fire with regard to Y 45, cf. Duchesne-Guillemin 1949-51, 638-9).

It should be noted that Y 45.1 introduces eschatological dimensions by its worry whether "the deceitful blasphemer, by his evil choice, may not destroy the world a second time with his tongue through preference being given to him" (an echo can be heard in Dk 9.38.2). This motif was developed in the S[ti]ūgar version of the commentary which I see as sort of some *ta'wif*, spiritual exegesis, to the Gāθā.

Such *ta'wif* was perceived (cf. Corbin 1977, 12) as imaginative reconstruction of the hidden reality, unveiling possibilities of other existences. It is of interest, in this context, to ponder upon the double interpretation of cīθrā, understood once as "manifestus, bright", paydāg, and once as "world, existence, creature" etc. This double interpretation may have been going back to an early period of the Gāθā exegesis, and does not exclude the more rigorous insights of the Bag and Warštmanšār versions. On the contrary, by the apposition of the world as "bright" (cīθrā), where the pun (mazdāhō.dūm) probably equates the world with Ahura Mazda himself, to the dark existence of the Stinking Spirit, on the one hand, and by combining it with Y 45.4, the spiritual unity of the father-creator-the thought-the world with his daughter-the mind-the earth was meditated upon, leading to the demand (in the Pahlavi Yasna and in the Bag and Warštmanšār versions) to perform the next-of-kin marriage. It is worth noting that the Zoroastrian is taught to profess, on his initiation at the age of fifteen:

"My mother is Spendarmat, Archangel of the Earth, and my father is Ohrmazd, the Lord Wisdom".

It was probably overlooked by the Western scholars that the next-of-kin marriage of Ohrmazd with his daughter Spendarmat is void of purely sexual overtones. The pious Zoroastrian authors of the last two centuries were eager, of the other hand, to deny, as is well known, the historical reality of such religious demand whatsoever. As the right-mindedness of good works, Spenta- Armaiti, is born in and produced from the lordly thought (Ahura- Mazda- the Lord the Thought) in the lofty world of possibilities, which we call "ideal" (cf. Y 45.4cd), so [good or bad] works are procured in the "nether", or, gētīg, world by thought and choice

(cf. Y 45.1e, varanā). The procurement of the deed by the thought was equated thus by Zoroaster to Ohrmazd's *autogenesis* (this could be the original sense of xVēdōdah). What for Zoroaster was, most probably, a statement about the nature of human thinking (cf. Gershevich 1995), became a mythologized mystical meditation to be projected into the gētīg world by performance of the xVēdōdah.

What is important is that Ohrmazd begot Spendarmat (and Wahman), not that he took it to wife. The mention of Wahman in this context, though not without significance by itself, only serves to emphasize this point. It is nowhere said by whom Ohrmazd begot her, as it was not said either anything about the mother of Hrmazd and Ahremēn in the classical Armenian and other Zurvān accounts. This not only illustrates that Ohrmazd/Zurvān was both the father and the mother, but spotlights the irrelevance of this problem: the point is the paternal-filial pattern, not the marriage by itself, as in the Zoroastrian *halakha* the aim of the next-of-kin marriage is not the incestual coitus as such (true, its merits are enumerated frequently, cf., e.g., even in the passages in question, Dk 9.60.3, only in order to encourage people to perform their religious duty), but rather to produce (spiritually) better descendancy, or, "properly produced progeny" (Dk 9.60.2), which is that produced "according the nature of the first creature, (through) begetting of one's own" (*ibid.*), i.e., the first next-of-kin begetting serves as the model for the future generations of Zoroastrians. Surely, it was the androgynous character of the creator that was to be imitated by the xVēdōdah marriage, while *imitatio Ohrmazdi* was seen as a means of the sacramental union with the creator.

At that point, an analogy with the Manichaean accumulation of light arises (and, I think, it is not without importance that the Manichaeism is a monastic religion, i.e., totally opposing the basic Zoroastrian tenets): the next-of-kin marriage purifies the creation and assists to return it back to the original motionless³ and pure state of oneness. The metaphor of the sequence "light - splendor - radiance - brilliance" (rōšn - brāh - fērōg - bām) in Dk 9.38.6, which resembles very much some Manichaean ideas, serves as an illustration to the progressive march to Renovation (ō Frašgird paywastan mardom).

³ Note the stress of nēmag ī rōz, "midday" (the initial position of the sun at the creation), in the context of the next-of-kin marriage in § 27 of Dk 9.41 (which describes a Zand (Warštmanšār 18) to Y 48 (Yezt); DkM 861.20-864.18; DkD 665.10-669.10; West 1892, 284-289) [Text VI].

As the primal consanguinal begetting set in motion the *mēnōg* and *gētīg* aspects of the creation (Wahman, cf. Dk 9.38.6), there was a need to introduce more *mēnōg* and *gētīg* qualities into the *mēnōg* and *gētīg* sphere (Spendarmat, *ibid.*). It was by means of this that Spendarmat accepted her maternal glory, *mādarīg x^varrāh*, i.e., became Ohrmazd's spouse, while the verb used (*wāspuhragēntān*) applies to princes of blood, meaning that she was seen, indeed, as Ohrmazd's daughter (cf. Dk 9.54.2 [TEXT VII]). I.e., the emphasis is, again, on her motherhood and princely status, not on the marriage (and sex) as such: it is giving (or, creating) of him(her)self (ka *x^vadīh dahīšnīh*, Dk 9.38.5) that the texts stress, ergo, accepting (cf. Dk 9.38.3), instead of intermingling.

Though all three, namely *S[t]ūdgar*, *Warštīmansār* and *Bag Nasks* belong to the *Ġāθānīg* group, it is the *S[t]ūdgar* which possesses the uppermost *Ġāθānīg* characteristics, while the *Warštīmansār* has something of the *Hāta[k]mānōrīg* and the *Bag Nask* has clear *Dādīg* traits. While accepting the theory forwarded in Shaked 1969a about the hierarchy of the religious texts in Sasanian Zoroastrianism, it is, however, strange that the *S[t]ūdgar* version, presumably made for the *gāhānīg* people, became so widely circulating that many important secondary Pahlavi texts, like the *Bundahīšn* and the *Zand ī Wahman Yasn*, heavily drew upon it, and not upon the versions given in the *Warštīmansār* and *Bag Nasks*.

The legend of *Kərəsāspa- / Keršāsp* retold in Dk 9.15 [TEXT V] is of great interest; the *Dēnkard* version is a short *midrashic Zand* derived from the *S[t]ūdgar Nask* on the beginning of *Yasna Adfravaxšyā* (Y 45.1). It appears that, in fact, the version of *S[t]ūdgar Nask* has nothing in common either with Y 45, or with the versions of the *Warštīmansār* or *Bag Nasks*, which treat mostly the topic of next-of-kin marriage. The actual source of the *original S[t]ūdgar Nask* was not a translation, or a commentary, of Y 45, but mythological texts which happened to have only a couple of allusions to the *Pahlavi* versions of the *Ġāθā* in question: the reason why the *Kərəsāspa- / Keršāsp* legend should become a commentary to Y 45 is that a passage treating the *x^vēdōdah* marriage contained expressions found also in the myth. *Rapīθēin zamān* [TEXT VIIIb] / *nēmag ī rōz*, "midday" [TEXT VI],

and *ārštītiθ.barāza*, "the height of a spear" [TEXT VIII] / *3 nēzag bālāy kē dagrandīh 3 nāy*, "an altitude of the height of three spears of the length of three reed each one" [TEXT VI], are leading phrases which, from the point of view of the compiler of the *S[t]ūdgar Nask* version, enabled him to establish the link between the text treating next-of-kin marriage and the myth.

The myth to which refers [TEXT V] occurs in Yt 19.40 [TEXT VIIIa], whose version in Pahlavi is found in PY 9.11 [TEXT VIIIb]; it is to be noted that on one point which is crucial in our context of Dk 9.15, there is an interesting discrepancy between the two last texts: in Yt 19.40, *yō janāt ažiṃ sruuaram yim aspō.garēm nara.garēm yim višauuantēm zaritām yim upairi viš araōdāt* was adequately rendered into Pahlavi in PY 9.1, except *ārštītiθ.barāza*, understood, unexplainably, as "the height of a horse", not "the height of a spear"⁴. The Pahlavi version (PY 9.11) of Yt 19.40 also leaves untranslated *xšuuāēpalla vanalia.barāšna yim upairi viš araōdāt*, adding instead a gloss. A quotation from another Pahlavi version of the *Kərəsāspa- / Keršāsp* legend is to be found in PRDD 18f5 (Williams 1990, I 104, 105; II 40, 165 [TEXT IX]).

The function of this myth in our context is introduction of the eschatological theme. *Frēdōn*, who is dead for 9000 years⁵, is unable to oppress *Aži Dahāg* (PRDD 48.32-34 [TEXT X]), so *Waters, Fire and Vegetation* ask *Ohrmazd* to revive *Frēdōn* [TEXT XI], but it is not *Frēdōn* who is raised from the dead⁶ [TEXTS X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV].

4 Compare *anguṣṭha*, "a kind of linear measure" in the Sanskrit version (cf. Bharucha 1912).

5 It is of significance (as Cereti 1995, 222, observed) that the battle between *Aži Dahāg* and *Frēdōn* is placed (in ZWY 9.14) at the beginning of time (9000 ago).

6 *Kərəsāspa*'s *hōš*, "consciousness", was supposed to dwell in the *Karkōy Fire* of *Sīstān*: *afrōz bāda rōš xwānīd Keršāsp hōš hamē be rast az jōš nūš kun may-nōš dōst bar āgōš nihād bād afrīn goš hamēša nekī kōš dī godhast ō dōš šāhā, xwādāyganā! be afrīn-e šāhī!*, "let the light of the spirit of *Keršāsp* blaze forth! Released from trouble, haste to imbibe ambrosial wine, take the beloved one in your embrace and incline your ear to blessing. Strive ever after god, for last night is past. King Lordy One, blessing upon your dominion!", Srimova 1974, 70 & 399 n. 133; Russell 1989, 53-4 n. 9. The form of the name given in GrBd TD2 230.14 is older: *Karsvasp* (*Kərəsavazdah*) *kē kēdān xwānēnd*, "Karsvasp whom they call *kēdān*" (in IndBd K 20 fol.128r3, Pāzand: *kādān*, cf. Bailey 1990, 6).

In the parallel⁷ AyJ 17.6 [TEXT XII] it is not Keršāsp who was raised from the dead, but rather his father Sām⁸, and it was overlooked that in ZWY 9.22 Sām⁹ rises and vanquishes Aži Dahāg. Unlike PRDD 48, Kay Xusraw plays here no rôle in assisting Sōšyans.

The legend is characterized by fluidity of motives, among which are: a hero performing some religious offend (Keršāsp in Dk 9.15.1 and in Y 9.11; Frēdōn in Bd 29.8 [TEXT XIV]); a hero sleeping in some enclosed place, whether Limbo (Dk 9.15), or wormwood and snow (Bd 28.29), or cave (cf. Dk 9.23)¹⁰. The hero may have different names, and the myth can have variants, thus demonstrating that it was the paradigm, not the story, that was important for the Zandist. The confusion of Sām and Keršāsp resulting in emergence of a new personage, Sāmān Keršāsp, can only illustrate this situation. It is interesting that in ZWY 9.19 it is unequivocally stated that Fire, together with Water, was this who forced the Creator to raise up Sāmān Keršāsp. If we take the body of our texts as a unity, we may draw the conclusion that this implies atonement of Keršāsp's misdeed towards Fire. Certainly, the atonement plays some rôle in the myth retold as an alluding commentary, but the significance of it remains elusive; probably, it serves as a substitute for the concept of Renovation. It must be stressed that the Bd and ZWY versions, and many components of these two texts as a whole, go back to the S[t]ūdgār Nask, probably, not only re-working S[t]ūdgār materials, but also quoting otherwise non-extant passages. The gap between the actual Gathic text and its allegorical retelling in the form of a myth in the S[t]ūdgār version is so wide that one may be led to believe that some apocryphic texts, like ZWY, can be, indeed, *real Zands*. This observation raises a question: why it was the S[t]ūdgār version of the commentary that was so successful to survive? Why it was the material, partly, probably, going back to pre-Zoroastrian times, that was transmitted so well into the Muslim period of the Iranian history and incorporated into the Persian National Epic?

The answer, I presume, is more complicated than the assumption that it was the narrative value of the myths of old that enabled them to survive for such a long time. The myths have already undergone a profound Zoroastrianization, and I do not think that they were included into the "Gathic lore" by mercy of an attempt to reconcile the teachings of Zoroaster with those of his former co-religionists. In was rather the mystic insights of the old myths adapted to allude to Gathic passages that assured their pertinence.

⁷ Cf. Messina 1939, 75, quoted as such in Kreyenbroek 1985, 131-2.

⁸ Originally, cf. Christensen 1931, 60, 99-106, 129-46, Sām and Kerāšpa were one and the same person. Cf. now some important remarks in Skjærvæ 1995b.

⁹ If one does not read *Sāmān, as it stands in PRDD 48.34-35.

¹⁰ It could be noted, in passing, that the enigmatic appellation "Kept, Preserved" of the Mandaean *Sam Smira* may be (at least, partially) connected.

The Gāōic Vahū[k]-Xšaer *fragard*, a part of the S[t]ūdgār Nask, is a kind of *tafsir* *irfānī*, to use Molé's terminology¹¹, on the Gāōā Vohū Xšaerām (Vohuxšaera Gāōā), "the Gāōā of Good Rule/Power", or "Well-Royalty", Y 51 [TEXTs XV-XVI]. The Bag Nask version of the same Gāōā is given in Dk 9.66, West 1892, 379-381; it was also referred to in Dk 9.10, Dk 8.13.8, 35.13 (and in Y 41.1 and perhaps in other texts) [TEXT XVII].

The Warštmanšar version is given in Dk 9.44, West 1892, 294-8 [TEXT XVIII]. This *fragard* is summarized in Dk 9.21; the text can be found in DkM 810.8-815.2; DkS XVII, 49-58; DkD *missing folios* 174-182; transliterated and translated in Molé 1959; translated in West 1892, 212-219; other important treatments in Zaehner 1961, 142-5; Tafazzoli 1971, 197. This is a *midrashic* text of a composite character, and it is this version which will be scrutinized here [TEXT XIX].

It must be noted that this text (the *Zand* of Vohuxšaera Gāōā) which is supposed to treat the Good Rule, Vahū[k]-Xšaer, treats actually Tyranny, stahmagih. The idea of "Good Rule" was central for Sasanian Iranians, especially in the late decades of the Third Iranian Empire, when the legitimacy of the ruling dynasty was challenged by pretenders and internecine strife. Immediately after decades of turmoil, the unthinkable happened and the Empire collapsed.

This situation brought about a renewed wave of speculations about the idea of "Good Rule". It was during this post-Sasanian stage of the development of the *Zand* on the "Good Rule" that Frēdōn's rôle was stressed (cf. further). On the whole, this version of Y 51 can be seen as an actual commentary.

I take it for granted that Dk 9.66.1-2 (the Bag Nask version, whose 22 *fragards* are summarized in the third part of Dk 9, chapters 47-68) is not the beginning of the enlarged commentary on Y 51.1, but the compiler rather imported it from elsewhere pretty near to the start of the commentary original. The beginning was omitted as the redactor thought the contents of the *Zand* were well-known.

As one could see, this is not the situation now: the PY version is of too interlinear a character, while the Dēnkard version is too elusive. To use a parallel from the traditional Jewish exegesis, we have here no *pešā*.

In my opinion, at least a part (line 2) of the PY version goes back to the stage in the Iranian linguistic history that corresponds roughly to Late Achaemenid/Selucid/Early Arsacid epochs. As to the Bag Nask version, it could be dated to the period after some political turmoil took place.

Theoretically, the date in question could be the epoch after the Arsacids overturned the Seleucid rule in Iran, or after the Arsacids were deposed by the Sasanids. On the other hand, as the style is characteristic of a much later period, one could suggest that this *Zand* was perhaps part of Bahrām Gōbēn's propaganda. But, as the text contains nothing that could be understood as some kind of anti-dynastic slander, so it seems rather that some inter-dynastic strife is meant.

The clue-word is "now", translating the Avestan nūcī; the PY version does not stress this word especially (nūnāz: "it is up to us now to perform the best action of Ohrmazd"); the PY version does not stress the "tyrant" as an antithesis to the "good ruler", while the Bag Nask version states: "*They are authorized who are now in power. Tyrannical wicked lying people are not now in power*". Moreover, *tyrannical wicked lying people* are accused of having "*caused deception in the corporeal world by laments*".

My impression is that this text was composed after Xusraw I ascended to power, having been preferred by his father Kawād I to his elder son Kayōs, the pro-Mazdakite PadašxVārgar Sāh. There are three words in this version that support this dating:

- 1), *now*, used frequently in texts undoubtedly dated by the reign of Xusraw I Anōšurwān, 531-579 CE [*his present Majesty*, *Im bag*, etc.]¹²;
- 2), *laments*, reminiscent of the "Lament of the Ox" (Y 29), a text crucial in the Mazdakite speculation, thus also indicating the same period;
- 3), the verb bōzēnīdan, translated here "to excuse", but which actually belongs to the semantic field of *salvation*, the main aim of the Mazdakites.

Again, it is stated that "*when they will give the power to him who is good, they would be saved by his sovereignty. But him who was deceived by laments, him you should overcome, and also to do this to death and danger and deception*", and the "*Mazdakites should be overcome (wānēnīdan, the verb used also on Aži-Dahāk, cf. further)*". It was perhaps about that time that the gloss [ka Dēn rawāg bē kard], "[when he (the good ruler) propagated the Religion]" was inserted into the PY version (to the word nūnāz).

12 Cf. Ceretti 1992, 242.

The actual commentary to Y 51.1 is found in the version of Warštmanšār Nask, Dk 9.44.¹³ The passage is full of glosses and sub-glosses: *əm dād Zardu(x)št hān ī weh xVadāy kāmāg* is perhaps a quotation from an Avestan commentary; *əm dād* could explain the strange *g.m awē ī weh xVadāy kāmāg* of the PY version which has no counterpart in the Gāθā (if we do not suggest that 'w.m / OLm stands for *əm*); *arzānīg* is an explanation of *abāyēd* found in the PY version. *gēhān* ("world") is connected perhaps to a *xV ī astōmand* ("corporeal existence") found in the Bag Nask version (Dk 9.66.1).

It seems that there existed a common source for the Warštmanšār Nask and the Bag Nask versions to this Avestan passage, though it is impossible to tell what it was.

As a whole, the version of Warštmanšār Nask here treats not the whole of Avestan Y 51.1, but the first three words, introduced in a quotation from a (Avestan?) commentary; in the sequence *bāgam aibī.bairištām*, the crucial word *bāgam* is translated by *bahr* (or, **bār?*), while *dahišn* may stand for both *aibī.bairištām* and *vidīšmānāi* (as it does in other versions treated above); *tācī* is translated, as in other version, by *abzōn*, while the gloss *wizīdār dahišnīh pahlom kunišn* translates *šītaoθanāiš mazdā vahištām* (*wizīdār dahišnīh* for *mazdā*, cf. PY version, *kunišn ī Ohrmazd pahlom*, suggesting that *mazdā* is not a Vocative and, perhaps, even not the name of the Supreme Being¹⁴); *ud abartarīh ī kunišn az menišn gōwišn* is an "automatic gloss" to *kunišn*. Two sequences, *ašā antarə caraitī* and *taī nō nūcī varəšānē*, were left untranslated.

The corresponding version of the Sītīūdgar Nask (Dk 9.21.7, [TEXT XIX]), where the same Avestan passage was referred to was put into a *midrashic* setting and is merely a *gloss*. It is of interest that this is exactly where the stitch between the two different sources of the chapter is to be found. The gloss reads:

əmān awē ī weh xVadāy kāmāg bahr abar barišnīh,
 "We desire a good ruler to bring him our portion (taxes)".

13 But in other cases, e.g., Y 45, I believe it was the version of the Bag Nask (Dk 9.38) that grasped more successfully "the original meaning" of Zoroaster's words.

14 Not always Ahura Mazdā is rendered by the plain Ohrmazd (cf. e.g. AiW 1163-4).

The gloss there is actually taken from PY 51.1a: *ōm awē ī weh xwadāy kāmāg bahr abar barišnH*, "My desire is to bring the portion (taxes)¹⁵ to him who is a good ruler".

The only difference consists in changing of the pronomina from 1st sg to 2nd Pl, as required by the context in Dk 9.21.7.

After Dk 9.21.7 we have a *Zand* derived from a different source, most probably, from a *Yašt*, later incorporated into the *S[t]ōdgar Nask*. At this point we will turn to an analysis of the *S[t]ōdgar Nask midrash*.

In Dk 9.21.2 we have an allusion to Yima's being sawn (cf. Yt 19.46; Bd 17.5 / 31.5) by *Aži Dahāka*. After his ascent to power, *Aži Dahāka* enquires "collected/*all (*hambāstag*) people why the conditions of the world have deteriorated after Yima's death. The reason is, of course, the vicissitude of the royal glory, but this is not the answer *Aži Dahāka* receives.

The "collected/*all people", to judge from the context and especially from the semantics of this (*hambāstag*) adjective, are none other than the inhabitants of Yima's subterranean "steppen-arch of Noah", as it was called by previous scholars, i.e., of Yima's *vara*¹⁶.

Aži Dahāka is answered by the "people of the assembly" that "Yima warded off from the world need, misery, hunger and thirst, old age and death, mourning, lamentation, cold and heat when they are beyond the good measure, and the intermingling of demons with men".

This interesting passage is highly illustrative for the way of *Zand*. The Pahlavi version of people's answer addressed to the tyrant (Dk 9.21.2) is a paraphrase of an Avestan passage (Yt 9.5 [TEXT XX]; compare also WZs 32.2-4 [TEXT XX]), which is a very close rendering of Yt 13

15 The "portion (taxes)" standing for the problematic *bāgām* may indicate the date of the commentary by the epoch of the tax-reform carried out by Xusraw I.

16 Yima's *vara* is perhaps a result of confusion of Central Asian Iranian traditions with those of Mesopotamia. The Mesopotamian *vara* was at Uruk, which was known as "Uruk-the-(sheep)-Enclosure", or "Uruk-the-Sheepfold", or "Broad-Marted Uruk", Kovacs 1989, 3 n.1; Uruk in the Tablet 1 of the Gilgamesh Epic has features reminding those of Kangdiz. Gilgamesh was known also as king of the Netherworld in the institutional Mesopotamian religion, cf. Kovacs 1989, 117, similarly to Yima. The Gilgamesh Epic was known as far as Canaan (Megiddo) and Syria (Emar); Gilgmys/š and Hwbbš appear in the Aramaic Book of Giants from Qumran, Humbaba features also in Middle Persian Manichaean fragments of the same work, Theodor Bar Qoni knew Ganmagos (and so did as-Suyyūf much later), cf. Kovacs 1989, XXXII-XXXIV; Reeves 1992, 120-1 & 159 [compare also Reeves 1993]. Judging from this vast dissemination of the Uruk / Gilgamesh traditions, it is difficult to date the Avestan sources about Yima's *vara*: they may be as late as the beginning of the current Era.

[Frawardēn Yašt].130¹⁷ [TEXT XXII]: Jam abāz dāšt ēštād az gēhān niyāz škōhH ud sud ud tišn ud zarmān ud margH ud šēwan ud mōd ud sarmāy ud garmāy ī a-paymān ud āmēzišn ī dēw abāg mardom (translated above).

One only has to compare the Avestan (Yt 9.5) and the Pahlavi (Dk 9.21.2) sequences:

yimahe xšaθre aurvahe	Pahlavi equivalents:
nōiṭ aotām āha	sarmāy
nōiṭ garamōm	garmāy ī a-paymān
nōiṭ zaurva āha	zarmān
nōiṭ maraθyūš	margH,

while *nōiṭ araskō daēvōdātō*, "the greed/envy produced by dēws", is rendered as *āmēzišn ī dēw abāg mardom*, "intermingling of demons with men".

This latter alteration is of importance. The Indo-European tradition knew two important sequences, involving humans, namely, "gods and men"¹⁸ and "cattle and men"; in Avesta, the formula *pasu.vīra-* is frequent, cf. Indic *vīrapśāh* < **vīra.pśvá-*, meaning "abundance, wealth", Umbrian *u(e)iro pequo*, Latin *pecudesque virosque*¹⁹. Destroying Yima, *Aži Dahāka* destroyed the cosmic order, and this is what brought about the deterioration of the terrestrial conditions. Moreover, the men and the demons began to intermingle.

Besides the evident echoes of the Zoroastrian notion of "Mixture", *gumēzišn*, seen as negative, the word used in the Pahlavi passage, *āmēzišn*, from the same root as *gumēzišn*, may have had some sexual overtones as well. Further I will try to demonstrate that such overtones were indeed implied in the *fragard* in question.

As to the structure of Dk 9.21, it must be noted that after the short "Yima introduction", both Frawardēn Yašt and Zādsprahm passages go ahead with Frēdōn account. This is an introduction to the actual Pahlavi *Zand* (cf. West 1892, 212 n. 4), amplified by glosses, that

17 This link has not yet been noticed, as far as I can see.

18 This concept underwent serious change in Zoroastrianism: Old Indo-European *deva/daēva* "gods" became Zoroaster's demons, thus the whole idea got a very different pitch.

19 Compare Perikhanian 1983, 41-2.

follows (Dk 9.21.3): ud ēnāz kū: "āsānīh- dādār būd Jam [kū.š ciš hān kard ī mardomān āsānīh azāš būd] ud kāmāg- dādār" [kū.š nēwagīh pad dād šnāyēnīdārīh; kū.š mardom pad (rārōnīh dh šnāyēnīd), "and this, too, that Yima was creator of ease [i.e., he made things by which people are at ease] and creator of will/desire [i.e., goodness through the pleasing of the law; i.e., he pleased people through righteousness/for he taught people the righteousness]".

Unfortunately, we do not possess Dk 9.21.3 in the original Avestan; āsānīh- dādār and kāmāg- dādār are clearly translations from Avestan, as was noted by Molé 1959, 284 nn. 5-6; the original Avestan for āsānīh- dādār was probably *"one who put peace", with āsānīh rendering *šīdāti or the like²⁰; *kāmāg- dādārīh is glossed by nēwagīh and sub-glossed frārōnīh is clearly a "well will"; kāmāg generally renders vairīia²¹ and, in its turn, is frequently glossed by nēwagīh.

The next passage (Dk 9.21.4) seems to be a glossed translation from an Avestan original. This passage is one of the most difficult for interpretation; I suppose that the text is corrupt. My reading and translation is different from those offered in West 1892, Wikander 1941, 173, Molé 1959, Zaehner 1961, 142-3. It is appropriate here to provide the three translations made by these four scholars.

West: "And Aūdak, who made Yim the splendid and rich in flocks - who was struck down by you through violent assault - unauthorisedly desirous (*varak*) and eager for the world, produced want and destitution, distress and greed, hunger and thirst, and the sanctifier of Wrath the wounding assailant, Want without pastures, Terror, Destruction the secret-moving, Decay the decrepit, and the seven arch-demons".

Wikander: "Und Otak, die den glänzenden Yim mit den schönen Heerden, der von Euch gewaltsam getötet worden ist, ungebührlich lüstern und begierig auf weltliche Güter gemacht hat, und Not und Armut, Bedrängnis und Lüsternheit, Hunger und Durst, die Raserei mit blutiger Keule, die weidenzerstörende Not, den Schrecken und die geheime Gefahr und das teuflischgeschaffene Alter und die sieben verehrungswürdigen Dēvs geschaffen hat".

²⁰ Compare in Bd 1a.13=51: ū.š dād ō ayārīh xVāb āsānīh.dādār, "He (Šhrmazd) created the repose-giving sleep" (So also Ankdesaria 1956, 27; Zaehner 1955, 320: "sleep, the repose of the Creator"). It is worth noting that Dk 9.32.9-10 which is a partly parallel to the Bd locus, has nothing reminding of āsānīh.dādār; on the contrary, it speaks of "the *sleep [or, *sweat] produced by demons". This notion has no support in PY 32, the source of Dk 9.32. Cf. Chapter III.1 "Sleep and Sweat".

²¹ Also vouru-, cf. Darmesteter 1883, 182, on vōduru.vāṇwō.

Molé: "Mais Otak, qui inspira un désir illicite des choses de ce monde à Yamsēt aux beaux troupeaux que vous deviez assassiner traîtreusement, ainsi qu'à toi, rendit dignes de culte le besoin et la misère, l'angoisse et la concupiscence, la faim et la soif, la Fureur à la massue sanglant, la peste qui détruit les fourrages, l'abandon de la destruction, la vieillesse puante et les sept dēv".

Zaehner: "...he [Yima] was otak/utak²², for royal Yima of goodly flocks whom you struck down unjustly and by guile, let his lambs wander free upon the earth, and stopped the veneration of the demons of Need and Misery, Straitness and Craving, Hunger and Thirst, Wrath of the bloody spear, Want that has no pasture-land, Fear and Bane that moves in secret, Old Age whose breath is foul, and the demon of Concupiscence too".

In my opinion, the general sense of the passage is: 1., Yima was struck by Dahāg; 2., cattle was dispersed; 3., Ōdag established demonolatry. My own translation is as follows:

"And Ōdag (who let loose into the world the lambs²³ of Royal Yima [of the goodly flocks], whom you (Dahāg) struck down by a treacherous blow unjustly) established the veneration of the demons of Need and Misery, Straitness and Craving, Hunger and Thirst, Wrath of the bloody spear, Drought that has no pasture-land, Fear and Danger that moves in secret, Old Age whose breath is foul / depriving of issue (and the Seven Demons)".

(It is possible, I think, that the words at the end of the passage, haft dēw, 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬭𐬀 𐬳𐬀𐬭𐬀, read Āzaz dēw by Zaehner²⁴, were in some way confused by the copyist with the similarly written ud Ōdag, 𐬰𐬀𐬳𐬀𐬭𐬀; thus one has perhaps to combine the first and the last words of § 4., reading 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬭𐬀 𐬳𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬭𐬀 haft dēw- ōwādag).

²² Zaehner 1961, 143, wrote: "We cannot be sure what the word otak/utak means, but it is glossed as "he let his lambs wander free upon the earth"... anōtak (which can be analyzed as "not-ōtak") meaning "strange, alien, foreign or excluded", the opposite of xVēš, "kin"; otak would, then, mean "kinsman", and *kavuta would thus be [Yima] the "royal kinsman". But regarding connected words, cf. Schwartz 1975b.

²³ After Yima's death, his flocks got dispersed. For the idea, compare, e.g., Zechariah 13.7: "Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered", hāḳ 'eḷ hārō'e ūṭarūšēnā haššōn.

²⁴ Zaehner 1961, n. 76 on p. 330: āzaz for *haft or for *ud.ōt.

Giving besides "whose breath is foul"²⁵ as a variant translation of *duždaft* "depriving of issue", I keep in mind Pvd 19.6, where *duž.dānāg* Gannāg Mēnōg is a corruption for **duž.dāmānag*, translating *duždāmō*²⁶. Here, **duž.dāmānag* may mean "of evil issue/creation", in both senses: 1), procuring evil issues; 2), having been born from evil creation, and in Pahlavi, the oscillation -f/-m- frequently occurs (*daft*/ *dām*, like [Avestan] *rap-*/ [Pahlavi] *rām-*).

The myth referred to in this paragraph (Dk 9.21.4) is unknown otherwise, but its general pattern seems to be clear: it is departure of Yima's royal glory, his *x^varanah*, which was caused by some malicious deed of a second person (Aži Dahāg, in my interpretation), not by some obscure guilt of Yima himself. In our passage (Dk 9.21.4), *σδαγ*, who is responsible for establishing demonolatry, seems to be a newer import from another *Zand*(s); in the original Avestan text it was Aži Dahāka who was responsible for real, but later demonized, plagues; in Yima's *vara* the cattle was safe, now it is dispersed; Aži Dahāka's intervention is very much reminiscent of both Ahriman's *ēbgad*, the Primal Assault into the Ohrmazd-created good world, which assault caused the state of Mixture, *gumēzišn*, and of ancient Indo-Iranian myths on blocking the waters by a snake (Aži) and causing devastation²⁷ in the earth and the subsequent deliverance produced by, in many versions, *Θραετανα-* (*Frédōn*, who plays indeed the key rôle in the continuation of the narrative).

As was stated above, the theme of the departure of the *x^varanah* is referred to in Dk 9.21 differently than usually. In Yt 19.34 (cf. Hintze 1994, 191ff.) [TEXT XXIII], e.g., the emphasis is on "lying false word". Then Yima "moved around, wandered in distress, became stunned because of his disordered state of mind and concealed himself on the earth". There is something in this passage that makes one think that Yima might have been sometimes perceived as akin, in some way, to Ahriman himself: the verb *stārētō*, used of Yima, must give Pahlavi *stard*, which is frequently used of demonic creatures, compare, e.g., Bd 1.16: *Gannāg Mēnōg ... pad stardih sayast*, "the Stinking Spirit laid stunned" (cf. Zaehner 1955, 280), or Bd 4.1.

25 *duždaft*, a clear allusion to Gannāg Mēnōg represented by Aži Dahāka.

26 A hapax; AiW 758b: "des Absichten schlecht sind, der Böses im Sinn hat, arglistig"; Darmesteter 1880, 206: "guileful".

27 Note *hēz*, "drought"; *sēz ī nihān rawišn* appears in WZs 32.2 (cf. above), Pvd 18.8; 19.1-2 (perhaps, it was also the reading in Pvd 19.43, for which we have no Pahlavi version); *sēz* translated Avestan *iōiajah* also in other passages, being the normal correspondent to its Avestan derivative.

However, we do not possess any specific *Zand* to Yt 19.34, exactly as we do not possess any Avestan original of Dk 9.21.4, but another word used in the Avestan passage of *Zamyād Yašt* (Yt 19) may nevertheless show that such a *Zand* did exist, as it was reworked into the sources of the *Cihrdād Nask* (which, in its turn, was one of the sources of *Bundahišn*).

The word in question, *fraēštō*, posed to scholars a problem of interpretation²⁸. Hintze 1994, 193 [with bibliography of the previous studies], took it as "in Bewegung versetzt", an infinitive from *fra-īš*, but the word survives, in a wrong sense, in Bd 35.10 [TEXT XXIV].

For *x^varra* there are variant readings in this Bd passage (cf. Bailey 1988a, 19): GrBd A (TD) 229, 12, {also B (DH) 102.14 & C (TDI) 147.10} has *Frédōn az awēšān purr-GDH tar būd*, while the IndBd K 20, 127.5-6, Justi 1868, 78.5, has *Frédōn az awēšān purr-frašt tar bawēd*. Thus, *frašt* and *GDH*, according to Bailey, are synonymous; the reading *frašt* can be confirmed by additional examples, thus, "the base of GDH is *far-*, making impossible any longer to suppose that *farnah-* is no more than a phonetic change from *hyarnah-*... "The form *hyarnah-*, Av *x^varanah-*, Magian MP *xvarrah*, Pāzand *pur-xvarāh*, Armenian **xvarnavant-*, while MP *fāraxw*, NP *farrux*, should be considered to be a Magian replacement of *farnah-* to avoid for doctrinal reasons a profaned word" (Bailey 1988a, 19-20). As to the etymology, Bailey, *ib.*, tentatively compares the Latin *fors fert* and *fortūnā*.

Having no intention to enter into the mine-field of the *x^varanah* etymology, I cannot but express my opinion that what we have in these Bd variants is a survival of an old and now lost *Zand* to Yt 19.34. My view is that the *Zandist* was misled by

1), the fact that the word in question stands next to *x^varanō* (*x^varanō fraēštō*) and seems to agree with *x^varanō* grammatically;

2), by confusion with *3aēša-*, "cupiti potens, glücklich" (AiW 31).

The mistake resulted in taking *x^varanō fraēštō* (> *x^varra frašt*) as synonymous, thus Bd 35.10. This example demonstrates to what degree *Zands* were interrelated.

The "Seven Demons" mentioned in Dk 9.21.4 are perhaps those known from the *Yendidād* and related sources, e.g., Pvd 10.9-10 [TEXT XXV].

28 Darmesteter 1884, 293, e.g., translated *fraēštō* by "the great Yima", with a note: "doubtful".

These demons are mentioned also in Vd 19.43, for which no Pahlavi version is available. Bd 27.2-12 mentions six arch-demons [kamāragān dēwān], identical with those of the Vd 10.9-10, adding Akōman before Indr, cf. also Bd 34.27.

Now, let us check what we know about the demoniac Ōdag, who was confused at an early stage with Wadāyān of Vd 19.6 [TEXT XXVI]. About Wadāyān, who is otherwise unknown from the extant Avesta, designated as "dahyupat", "ruler of the land"²⁹, one has to suggest that this person was a male, not a female (cf. [TEXT XXVI]). As Vd, where the gloss is occurs, is a much-read text, it was only natural that Wadāyān could penetrate also other Pahlavi texts. There were probably more Zands on this person, an echo of which we find in Mēnōg ī Xrad [MX] 57.25 (Anklesaria 1913a, 155): ciyōn ō Wadāyān³⁰ dahyupat Dahāg dād, "as much as I have given the dahyupat Dahāg from the family of Wadāyān"³¹, with Wadāyān being understood as a generic. Dahāg, originally perhaps only a gloss to Wadāyān dahyupat, became a descendant of *Wadāy, whatever its gender is. Later on, the name came to be associated by popular etymology with words designating "bad progeny", "bereavement"; Central Asian New Persian wād, Georgian *evadag-i*, *vadag-i*, Ossetic *āvād*, "without descendants", *fyd-vād*, *fyd-vāt*, "having bad descendants" (on which cf. Bailey 1971, xl), are perhaps connected. The graphic form of the name found in the Vd MSs made such contamination possible³².

Two points must be noted about Wadāyān: its being a wealthy (Vd 19.6) ruler, dahyupat, and its being duždārmō, "of evil creation", possessing thus some negative attitude to procreation as seen from the Zoroastrian perspective. This is how it became Dahāg's mother³³, the demon Uda [read *Wada?] (cf. Bd 21.6 & 28.19; also West 1892, 212 n. 5).

In two passages in Dādestān ī Dēnīg (DD 72.1-9 [TEXT XXVII] and DD 78.1-2 [TEXT XXVIII]) she is a demon, Dahāg's mother, the initiator of adultery³⁴. Let us turn to the first passage. The exposition found there was based on old sources going back to the Sasanian period and

29 Cf. AiW.1344, Nyberg 1962, 45:25, 90:22-3 (Nyberg 1974, 200-11).

30 wtk'ng Pāzand: vadagan; Sanskrit: vadagana[rājane].

31 Tafazzoli 1364hš (1985), 75, 137, translated: hmēn'nhk bh wōy'n fr'm'nrw' dh'k d'dm.

32 Cf. the variants in Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp 1907, 612.

33 The identification of Ōdag as Aži Dahā's mother must be of some age (as Mandaic Ūr and Ruha belong to the same pattern, on which cf. Widengren 1960, 60, n. 216); compare Tabart I, 209.7, who has w'dk, and Wikander 1941, 171-4, 212.

34 In Dk 9.10.4 the form of the name, ōtak, enables interpretation as something like "kinsman" or "strange, alien, foreign or excluded", cf. Zaehner 1961, 142-3 and Schwartz 1975a.

now mostly lost. It is interesting to note that the compiler, as well as those who put the question to him, accept the sinning *kunmarz* Zoroastrians as members of the community. The question is whether does it do any good to perform the ceremony for the soul of the departed *kunmarz* Zoroastrian.

Manuščīhr, the author of DD, not only does accept them as members of the community, moreover, he even calls "Mazdayasnians" the seven arch-sinners he describes. The theological problem left aside, his text was invariably based on a *Zand* close to the gloss found in Pvd 19.6: "[there is someone who says that "Your ancestors also worshiped me, so worship me you too!"]". The *Zand* Manuščīhr was drawing upon was composed during theological disputes with Mazdakites, and probably also with Manichaeans and other "heretics". The heretics in questions pretended to be good Zoroastrians (DD 72.9): "One is that who preferred the heretical religions to the Law praised by the Righteous One, by deceit of perverting the Avesta and Zand which they call their own...". There can be no better "orthodox" description of what a *Zand* really is: he, this unnamed *Zand* (Mazdak?), based himself on a Zand which was his own, i.e., he regarded it as also his own, or it was restricted only to him (and his followers).

It is perhaps the only example in the whole Zoroastrian literature where an *ahmōy* is defined as one who "perverts", *wardēnīd*, the Avesta and possesses a *Zand*. Moreover, it is stated that he was influenced from other religious systems, *dēnīhā*, preferred by him to his own Zoroastrian legacy. This definition fits Mazdak better than Mani. One could see that the text of Manuščīhr is connected to Pvd 19.6 also from the designation of the Zoroastrian faith as dād ī stōd ī ahlaw, "the Law praised by the Righteous One", who is Zoroaster. This should be compared to the text of Vendīdād: ahlaw Zardu(x)št ... abāz stāy weh Dēn ī Mazdēsnān, "O righteous Zoroaster ... scorn the Good Mazdayasnian Religion", where the pseudo-etymological *abāz stāy* stands for the Avestan *apa.stauuanuha*.

Dahāka's mother, the former Avestan male *dahyupat*, is described in DD 72.5 as Mazdak's (who is alluded to in DD 72.9) forerunner: the dissembling of the big harems is defined as "adultery" and it brought about a disturbance of lineages and an intermingling of sons without the husband's authority, which was indeed one of the accusations against Mazdak. Mazdak's epoch was seen also as an era of "lack or royal command", *a-framānīh*. One may also assume that the figure of *Kirm* in KNAP, being an Aži Dahāg in disguise, was colored by the memory of

Mazdak³⁵.

In the passage quoted above from the 11th Nask, Hūspāram Nask (Dk 8.35.13-15 [TEXT XXX]), there is a link made between the Mazdakite sexual practices and Aži Dahāg: the communist practices of the Mazdakites are compared to the tyrannical deeds of Aži Dahāg, who was renowned for his abduction of women (cf. Yt 5.34).

A very late and "vulgar" *Zand* is to be found in the title of Aži Dahāg in *Sahrestān* Thā ī Erān, a geographical-mythological composition, §§ 18 & 49:

šahrestān ī Kōmis ī panjburg Aždahāg *ped ī šabestān* kard. mānīhā ī Pahlawīgān ānōh būd. pad x^vadāyīh ī Yazdgird ī Šānpuhrān kard andar tazand Cōi nērōg pāhr ī hān ārdag [SīL^v] arg³⁶.

"The city of Kōmis of the five-towers was built by Aždahāg the monstrous ruler³⁷. There were the dwellings of the Arsacids. Yazdgird the son of Šānpuhr made it in his reign against the foraying Cōi (North-Caucasian and Turkic peoples) to a strong watch-station of this region";

šahrestān ī Nahr Tīrag pad duš.x^vadāyīh ī Aždahāg *ped ī šabestān* kard ud zindān ī Erān-šahr būd, zindān ī Aškān būd,

"The city of Nahr Tīrag was built during the misrule of Aždahāg the monstrous ruler and it was the [State] prison of the Iranian countries, the prison of the Arsacids".

35 Though KNP contains older traditions, the extant redaction goes back to the last years of the Sasanian Empire. Cunakova 1987, 22-24 (with A.L. Ščervanovskij from the Special Astrophysical Observatory of the Academy of Sciences, USSR; cf. also Cunakova & Ščervanovskij 1982) succeeded in dating two different astrological/astronomical passages in the known recension of the KNP: the first and the older one (KNP 3.5) may be dated by 223-224 CE, and the second one (KNP 4.6) must be dated only by 23.12.631 CE. They also stated that Henning's emendation of KNP 3.5 (in MacKenzie 1979, S24, n.16) does not add any important astronomic information.

36 Translated 'side', cf. Utas 1988, 42; compare Shaked 1993b, 76a.

37 Cf. further.

In the latter paragraph Aži Dahāg is identified on the mythological level with the Greeks (Seleucus Nicator, cf. Marquart & Messina 1931, 55), and, on the other hand, an identification of the Parthian Arsacids with the "Greeks" (= Aždahāg) is implied. The appellation of Aždahāg as *ped ī šabestān* may refer to his harem activities, known from Yt 5³⁸. There is a considerable literature on the word *šabestān*³⁹, but as far as I know, these two *Sahrestān* paragraphs were never referred to while dealing with *šabestān*. On its face value, *ped ī šabestān* means "eunuch, in charge of a harem". In *Āyādgār ī Wuzurg-Mīhr* [PT 85; West 1887, 263-4; Bailey 1971, xlii-xliii] the title *zanīnbed*⁴⁰ *šabestān-šahr* [T] *ostīgān xusraw-darigbed*, "keeper of the women, trusted of the state (?!)" is given. Thus the meaning of *šabestān* as a word dealing with harems becomes corroborated⁴¹. The naming of Aži Dahāg a *ped ī šabistan* is due to his association with *ōdag* in DkM 810.13ff.; Zaehner 1961, 142-3, translated it "kinsman", from *anōdag*, "strange, alien, foreign, excluded" (MacKenzie 1971, 10: "strange, alien"); Schwartz 1975a, 407-9, explained *anōdag* as **an-autaka*, "non-local", comparing Sogdian *wt'kh, ōtāk*, Khwarazmian *wtc*, "place" > Turkish *oak*⁴². In two different traditions of the *Zand* the word was treated in two different ways: in that of Dk, the older **zantupati* was interpreted as from *zantu*, "tribe" > *ōdag*, which has also connotations of "helpful", etc. [cf. Schwartz, *ibid.*: Old Iranian **auta*, Sogdian *nwt*, "support"], while in the more popular (and later) tradition, based on the already existing *Zand ōdag*, it was interpreted as connected to the better known word for "room, harem", thus *ped ī šabistan*.

There are perhaps also some anti-Manichaean writings at the base of this text, alluded to in DD 72.4-5. While it is clear that DD 72.5 contains information about the Mazdakite movement and/or its outshots, it is possible that some survival of Manichaean lore derived perhaps from anti-Manichaean polemics are to be found in this passage. *ššuft* (DD 72.5) was closely associated

38 It can now be observed that the word occurs twice as Aždahāg's title.

39 Cf. Introduction, n. 99.

40 Cunakova 1991, 49, read it *winārbed* [T] *šabestān šahr*.

41 If this reading is to be preferred to that of Cunakova, cf. the previous note.

42 "Room" > Egyptian (etc.) Arabic *ʿoḍa*, *ʿoṭa*; Osmanli *odalısı*, *odalisque*.

with wiyartag⁴³; the Manichaean Middle Iranian term for the Fallen Angels/Archons is wišūdag, "abortion, daevic creature", from wišūdan, "bear daevic offsprings" (MacKenzie 1971, 92); another synonym was "ghwdg", cf. MacKenzie, *ibid.*, Boyce 1977, 42: "guhūdag", "misbom, misbegotten"; another Manichaean Middle Persian term is abgānag, from "to fall", as in Hebrew for "abortion, miscarriage; Watcher, giant", NPL⁴⁴. Intriguing, the Nephilim are sometimes glossed as "rebels"⁴⁵. And it was Iranian where these two meaning, "to fall" (that of the Hebrew NPL) and "to rebel" (that of the Semitic MRD) are expressed by one and the same root, pat-, like in Old Persian DB I:⁴⁶. A derivative from pat-, past, as an astronomical term, "dejection", exists in Middle Persian, cf. MacKenzie 1979, 524, cf. n. 16. Similar notions are known also in Western Semitic.

As to Aži Srōbar / Aži Sruvara's watcher-function (DD 72.4), it is not entirely fruitless to speculate whether it is not an import from the Manichaean lore; Skjærvæ 1996a, 267, quoted Sundermann⁴⁷ view that the Zoroastrian arch-demon Az is quite probably such an import from Manichæism⁴⁸. The Pahlavi version of the Avestan Y 9 (Hōm Yt) 34-39 (where we are told about Aži Sruvara's devouring horses and men), contains nothing helpful regarding rān-wēmāg-bēdārth.

It is only after this exposition of the sin of Aži Dahāg, Aži Srōbar and Wadag that we can come back to Wiyartag and Wiyabēntdag. The reason for combining all these persons together is Aži Dahāg's lordship, treated in the *Zand* to Y 51 (the Yasna of Good Lordship, Vohuxšaθrā Gāθa), and the pederastic rôle of Kauuīnō Vaeīpiīō in the same Gāθa (Y

43 wiyartag / wiyabēntdag clearly means "passive and active pederasts"; however, the words in question could be easily understood in sense of "leading astray", cf. Bailey 1971, 27 n. 2: Narsēh ī wiyābāntg "magician", cf. GrBd 228:13.

44 The rôle of the Nephilim, the Fallen Angels, in the account of Enoch and in the latter Manichaean material, is the background of such perceptions.

45 Hāraqayyā in Aramaic, where the play on words based on the name of Nimrod and Mardōn his son, known from Jewish *Midrashim*, is used, mārīdūn in Arabic

46 Cf. Kent 1954, 111: martiyah maguš āhat Gaumātah nāman hauv udapātātā, "there was a Magus=person called Gaumātā, he revolted".

47 In *South Asian Studies* 2 (1986), unavailable to me.

48 Compare Zaehner 1955, 166ff., and Sundermann 1979b, 124 n. 133.

51.12)⁴⁹.

The "sodomy" is described as gand, gandišn, "stench". This word contains the same root as Gannāg Mēnōg, and in DD 72 both are indeed associated, though not called by these respective names: grāy wināh kēšān Ahriman-warzišn nazdīkaš 5 Ahriman bawēnd, "of the grave sin, who were close to Ahriman in their Ahrimanic practice"; gandišn found close to muhragān, DD 72.7, must go back to an ancient and authentic understanding of the Avestan muθra- (compare Schwartz 1985a, 488).

DD 72.5-7 is connected to DD 78.1-2 [TEXT XXVIII]. DD 78.2 seems to be a fuller version than DD 72.5: DD 78.2 has rōspīg.bāragīh (DD 72.5: rōspīgīh), a-dastūr ī Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp kēš šōy būd Wadag (DD 72.5: ūš a-dastūr ī šōy); kēš x^vēš a-sturīhā a-dādestānīh wināh warzišnīh grāy abēr was, omitted by DD 72.5; it preserves the name of Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp, Dahāg's father. The late and polemical, anti-Mazdakite, character of DD 72.5 could be better understood if we see what it added as compared to DD 78.2:

ewag Wadag ī Dahāg mādar kēš fradom rōspīgīh kard ūš wisptōhmagīh āsurt, a-framānīh bōštd, ūš a-dastūr ī šōy abāg pus pus hamēn.mēzišn bawēd (additions italicized). Now, what is omitted:

passax^v ēd kū rōspīg.bāragīh grāy abārōn hast. fradom Dahāg⁵⁰ kard, āšnag pad abārōn gumēzišnīh īš kāmāg abāg Wadag ī mādar andar zīndagīh ī Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp īš pidar a-dastūr ī Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp kēš šōy būd Wadag kēš x^vēš a-sturīhā a-dādestānīh wināh warzišnīh grāy abēr was (omissions italicized). Such truncation of texts used as a base for a newer *Zand* is extremely typical also for Dk 9.

49 Cf. Dk 9.44.14 (DkM 869.8): abar dušmānīh ī Kay Waēp ī Axt ī duš.dēn ī tam.ax^v 5

Zardušt, also Zdsprn 25.10, Ankdesaria 1964, 92, Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 86 & 165, Tafazzoli 1995a; Dhabhar 1949, 225 n. 14, has in Pāzand, according to AiW 1323 and Humbach 1991, I, 189; II, 228, means "pederast", other rendering *apud* Tafazzoli 1995a, 296; according to Tafazzoli, *ibid.*, there is nothing common between this individual and Axtīa-, Axt the sorcerer, Yt 5.82.

50 DD 72.5: Wadag

Now we turn to DD 73.1-2 [TEXT XXX]. This seems to be an extension of the theme dealt with in DD 72.7. The source is to be looked for in the Sasanian Avesta, in an extract from which [Dk 8.35.13 (DkM 747.16, cf. West 1892, 112)] *wiyaftag* and *wiyabēnīdag*, *Aži Dahāg*, *Srōbar*, *Tūr ī Brādroxš* ī *karap* and *anahlamōy* are mentioned together (6 "sinners").

In the version of DD 72 there are 7 "sinners"; the order there is as follows: *Aži Dahāg*, *Aži Srōbar*, *Wadag* (who is an import from the *Zand* of Y 51, Dk 9.21), *Tūr ī Brādroxš* ī *karap*, *wiyaftag*, *wiyabēnīdag*, *ahlamōy*.

The parallel list in Dk 8.35.13, again in the context of *wiyaftag* ud *wiyabēnīdag*, "both sorts of "sodomites", is as follows: *Aži Dahāg*, *Srōbar* gaz⁵¹, *Tūr ī Brādroxš* ī *karap*, *ahlamōy* ("the deceitful heretic").

A very interesting chapter of *Dēnkard* 9 is Dk 9.10 (DkM 794 [TEXT XXXI]), being an abbreviated account of the mythological S[t]ūdgār Nask; on the face value, this ninth *fragard* Yāθāiš must refer to the sixth hā first Gāθā (Y 32.1), but I failed to find any closeness between the Pahlavi version of this Gāθā and Dk 9.10.

However, similarly to Dk 9.21, Dk 9.10 is based on PY 51, perhaps in a version different from that which we possess now.

The reason is perhaps that this particular Yasna, namely, Y 51, contains allusions to the events from the Prophet's life, thus being apt to acquire *midrashic* additions. It is not impossible that the sources of Dk 9.10 and 9.21 were similar to the sources of *Vita Zoroastri* (Dk 7).

The main subject of Dk 9.10 seems to be "sodomy/pederasty"⁵². The theme (Y 51.12) was already alluded above. The Avestan Y 51.10b *huuō dāmōiš drōjō hunuš tā duždā yōi hāntī* can be paraphrased as follows: "this evil offspring of the creation of deceit he gives bad gifts / misery to those that exist"; the Pahlavi version renders it: *hān dām drōj hunušak hān ī duždānāg kē hēnd*, "this evil offspring of the creation of deceit, they are possessors of evil knowledge", glossed *kū pad anāgih pad dāmān ī Ohrmazd kardan hāwand hunušak ī gannāg mēnōg hēnd*, "i.e., to act wrongly towards the creatures of Ohrmazd means to be similar to those who are the evil offspring of the Stinking Spirit", compare above, DD 72.2. Note that both Dk texts (Dk 8.35.13 and Dk 9.10.3) contain glosses: "'great in sinfulness[, like ...]"; "one says that 'the grave sinfulness' means..."; the common trait of the Dk

⁵¹ Or, AŽ.

⁵² I will deal with Zoroastrian sources on the subject elsewhere.

texts is equating of the "sodomites" to the "sinners" mentioned above⁵³, while the DD text only compares both groups. It is obvious that the three texts go back to the same source, but the crimes of the "sinners" are given differently:

Aži Dahāg, DD 72: witchcraft and misrule; Dk 9.35: tyranny; Dk 9.10: witchcraft

Srōbar, DD 72: watcher's functions and devouring; Dk 9.35: witchcraft; Dk 9.10: tyranny

Wadag, DD 72: adultery etc.; cf. there; Dk 9.35: absent; Dk 9.10: producing evil offspring

Brādroxš, DD 72: killing the best of people⁵⁴; Dk 9.35: the righteous-slaughter⁵⁵; Dk 9.10: *ib.*

wiyaftag, *wiyabēnīdag*, cf. there

ahlamōy, DD 72: deceit; Dk 9.35: falsehood; Dk 9.10: grave sinfulness.

Originally, *ōdag* was not identical with *Wačayān*. In Pvd 1.19 we read:

*Sānzdahom az gyāgān ud rōstāgān am pahlom frāz brēhinīd man kē Ohrmazd [hom] abar pad Ōdā (LŠŠ) ī *Arawestān [ī Hrōm] kē asardār abar mānīšn hēnd [kū zūd abāz ēstēnd]. [hast kē ēdōn gōwēd ēd: "xʷadāy pad xʷadāy nē dārēnd"] azēš pad hān ī awē pidyāragīh frāz kirrēnīd Gannāg Mēnōg purr.marg zamestānaz dēwān.dād [stahmagtar bawēd] *taožiāca dānhaus aiwištāra**

⁵³ This *Dēnkard* chapter contained also some other material relating to illicit forms of intercourse. Thus, it is stated (Dk 8.34.14-15):

14. *abar grān wināhīh ī abus ud pēmēnīdag zan kēš lōhmag zahag az jud gušn marzīdan ud cē andar ham dar.*

15. *abar abzōnīg zōrīh ī zan az gušn abar rawīšnīh ud kast zōrīh ī gušn az abar rawīšnīh ī ō zan.*

14. "About the grave sinfulness of a woman having just given birth and giving milk whose seed is the offspring from copulation with different males and what belongs to the same subject".

15. "About the increasing strength of the female from male's mounting (on her) and the diminishing strength of the male from (his) mounting on the female".

The last paragraph was perhaps of a rather "scientific" than purely legalistic character. One could speculate whether it was stated that it is by Anhrman's intervention that "the diminishing strength of the male" is caused.

⁵⁴ Zoroaster is meant in all the three instances.

⁵⁵ The Dk wording is closer to the expected *Zand* version; that of DD is younger.

"The 16th of places and lands, the best created by Me, Me who is Ohrmazd, is in Oḏā (LSJ) ṯ *Arawestān [of Byzantium], who are lacking chieftains living [*i.e.*, they are soon to revolt] [there is one who says: "they do not hold rulers as the rulers"] thereupon, the Stinking Spirit full of death produced as their adversary the winter created by demons [it is more oppressive] the devastation of the Arabian country".

Here, Oḏā (LSJ) [ṯ *Arawestān] renders Avestan *aoḏaēšu raphaia-* (cf. AiW 42), a vague expression found also in Rašn Yašt (Yt 12.18), for which we possess no Pahlavi version.⁵⁶ This Oḏā (LSJ) has nothing to do with Waḏayān of Vd 19.6. Most editors read in Pvd 1.19 Arangestān, where I read *Arawestān⁵⁷; the text has, actually, ~~Arangestān~~, while one MS, DDJ, glosses it as عرستان (*sic!*), cf. Jamasp 1907, 18, 20. n. 2.

Oḏā / Oḏag was perhaps identified with some Arabic word, such as *wādī, or personal name ʿuḏay, or ʿuḏā, "enemies"⁵⁸. As to the geographical name, Oḏā may be connected to the Greek [not Aramaic] name of Edessa, and Arang may reflect *Abgar (though, it may be read *Arwand and indicate Orontes). However, the identification of the country with Arabs seems to be old, as reflected in an old Avestan gloss, *taoziiaśca dānhaus aiwištāra*, where *taoziiaśca* was understood as Tāzīgān, "Arabs". Indeed, Bd 31.37-8 (Anklesaria 1956, 268-9; Anklesaria 1908, 208.13ff.), which is an abbreviated version of Pvd 1.19, has:

Sānzdahom *Oḏag Arang pahlom.dād, hunuśak ṯ Tāzīgān Oḏag. ūš pīdyārag ēn wēš mad kūš sardār pad sardār nē dārēnd, ud zamestānēz ānōh grāy bawēd, ud Tāzīg abar mānēnd,

"The 16th best created is *Oḏag Arang, *Oḏag being the evil offspring of the Arabs. Its adversary came to it most as they do not hold chiefs as the chiefs and the winter is there severe. The Arabs live there".

⁵⁶ Cf. PhilVd 1.19; MacKenzie 1989, p. 548b-549a, noted that Avestan *Raḥa* / Pahlavi *Arang*, was identified with Pahlavi *Arwand*, properly *Orontes*, but confused with the *Tigris*. Cf. Shapira 2000.

⁵⁷ The *w* is from Aramaic.

⁵⁸ An example of similar plays with Arabic words we most probably have in Dk 3.184 etc., where the name of an Arabian sheik, Pātšraw/Pādō[k]sraw, was perhaps analyzed as containing *badw*/bādī, "bedouin", in his name, cf. below.

Here, *Oḏag Arang is the result of a simplification of Oḏā ṯ *Arawestān; Oḏag became connected with Arabs (cf. the latter Arab descent of Dahhāk) and was identified with a demon with the same name (Bd 27.23, Anklesaria 1956, 236-9; Anklesaria 1908, 184.8ff. [TEXT XXXII]).

The next step was making Oḏag Dahāg's mother (Bd 35.7, Anklesaria 1956, 292-3; Anklesaria 1908, 184.8ff.): Dahāg ṯ Xrutāsp ṯ Zēnīgāw ... az mādarān Dahāg ṯ Oḏag, "Dahāg son of Xrutāsp son of Zēnīgāw ... from his mother's side: Dahāg son of Oḏag". Actually, this link was probably hinted to already in Bd 31.37, *hunuśak* ṯ Tāzīgān Oḏag, cf. PY 51.10b, Dk 9.10.3 (on Waḏay). DD 78.2 and 8d 35.7 have the name of Dahāg's father as Xrutāsp.

The theme of Aži Dahāga's barrenness as a result of his (hinted) homosexuality is referred to in Dk 9.21.5; in Dk 9.21.6 the astral functions of Yima are stressed:

ud ēnaz kū: "pusar wēnēdat bē Až a-pusth kard duš.x^varrah [hād šibist⁵⁹ x^vad.kard] ṯ abē kard sēj (kūš cārag x^vāst nē šāyēd) kē nē wālēd az tan [kū paywand azaš ne rawēd]. 6. ūt gōspand ṯ frāx^v.raftār az mardomān gadag⁶⁰ dārēd ud tō az amāh bē appurd hān ṯ bāmīg ṯ rōšn Yim ṯ šēd ṯ. huramag kē pad harwisp ~~~~~ (h^y, ʿhy?⁶¹) abar rasišnīh pad hamāg zamestān īš pad hutābišnīh tāft [kūš gyāg pad nēwagīh kardan bē mad].

"And this, too, that they see (look for?) a son, but it is you, O Snake, that made them barren (just having given birth), you, O that of Evil Destiny! [*i.e.*, monstrous self-produced] not-completely made draught [that it is impossible to look a remedy for] who does not increase from their bodies [*i.e.*, there is no issue proceeding]. You rob from men their wide-going sheep and you (Aži Dahāg) have deprived us of brilliant and bright Royal Yima of goodly flocks, who, at every approach of h^y / ʿhy during the whole winter, shone with his good heat [*i.e.*, he came to places in order to do good]".

⁵⁹ Molé: "NP répugnant"; West: "monster"; Šēbāg, "viper", Šēbišn, "confusion".

⁶⁰ Cf. Zs 32.4; Arabic KDY "to beg", *kudyat* "begging, mendicity", is perhaps a loan from Iranian.

⁶¹ Tafazzoli 1974a, 120-1, saw here an Avestan transliteration; cf. also Tafazzoli 1989a, 367-8.

*sayag? West: "in on every evil contingency"; Molé: "tous les fois qu'il y avait ombre". Tafazzoli identified here several translations from Avesta: abar rasišnīh=aiwi gati. ʿys ēs/Ts Av.*isu/aesu "frost", cf. aēxa>NP yax, "ice"; "to freeze", Vd 9.6: zamō isaoš aiwi.gaitīm, "on the arrival of the cold winter"-zamestān [ṯ] snēhōmand.

The next paragraph (Dk 9.21.7), as was previously noted, is the place where the stitch between two different sources is to be found:

ōšōmand hēh, Bēwarāsp, tō-z bē ških, ciyōn ēn dādestān ēdōn kū xʷadāy
ī wad ciš ē ī ēdōn wad! amān awē ī weh xʷadāy xāmag bahr abar barīšnīh
[ciš ē awē dahom kē xʷadāyīh ī weh abāyēd ka kunēd]!

"Whither away, O Bēwarāsp, and be also broken, according to the law that a bad ruler deserves things as bad as he is! We desire a good ruler to bring him our portion (taxes) [I will give something to him who will exercise the Good Rule as it should be]!"

After that, the theme of the battle between Aži Dahāg and Frēdōn is introduced. It is known from many sources, cf., e.g., Bd 29.9 [TEXT XXXIII]. This tradition was well known also outside Iran proper. Armenian [Pseudo-] Movsēs Xorenac'i (cf. Thomson 1980, 126-8) wrote in his "From the Fables of the Persians":

"...Then a certain Hrudēn bound him (Biurasp) with bronze links (sarēok' pīndēok') and led him to the mountain called Dembavend⁶², and on the journey Hrudēn fell asleep and Biurasp dragged him to the hill; and Hrudēn woke up and led him to a cave in the mountain and bound him and placed himself there opposite him as a monument⁶³ (zink'n andri anddēm nora hastatē!); cowed by him, [Biurasp] remained subject to his chains (šit'ayicn⁶⁴) and was unable to go out and ravage the earth" [Thomson's translation adopted, with a slight addition].

This legend, derived from Armenian sources, was known also in Georgia as well. According to the *Qartlis Cxovreba*, "Georgian Chronicle", the Caucasian peoples, defeated by the Khazars, called to support Iranians, with their leader Ap'ridoni, "who tied with a chain Bevrasp, lord of

62 Damāwand; cf. ZWY 9.4, Bd 29.9.

63 Compare ZWY 9.15, *kirb*, cf. further.

64 A different word used; *šit'ay* is an Aramaic loan word, according to Hübschmann 1897, 314, from *šēšaltā*, *šōšiltā*, "Kette". A contamination with Aramaic **šiltā*, "a tool of control", is also possible.

serpents, and fastened him on a mountain which is inaccessible for men"⁶⁵.

The Mandæan *Ginza Rabba* has similar traditions (translated in Lidzbarski 1925, 411):

"Nach ihm war König Ašagan (Arsacids). Er regierte 470 Jahre. Nach ihm war König Dšamšid, den man König Salomon, Sohn des David, nennt. Er regierte 1000 Jahre; 900 Jahre auf der Erde und 100 Jahre im Himmel. Nach ihm war König Bruq...(?)" [GR 383.10-13⁶⁶];

"Hernach war Asdahag, Sohn des Asrag⁶⁷, den man König Bahrān⁶⁸ nennt. Er regierte 300 Jahre. Nach ihm war König Farīdūn, Sohn des Tibian (*AθBīyān). Er regierte 450 Jahre. Nach ihm war Pašm (*Sām?)-Nariman, den man den Fessler des Karkum⁶⁹ nennt. Er regierte 500 Jahre" [GR 382.20-25⁷⁰].

Here the basic scheme of the consequent rulers is preserved: Dšamšid (Yima), Asdahag (Aždahāg, equated with an usurper called *Bahrām), *Frēdōn, *Sām-Narīmān.

These legends demonstrate the vast dissemination of material relating to Frēdōn and Aži Dahāg in neighbouring cultures. This fact may probably reflect that the importance of the narrative of Frēdōn and Aži Dahāg in the popular Iranian religion was greater than in the

65 Translated in Thomson 1996, 16; Georgian (ed. Qauḫč'išvili 1955, I) 13.1-2: "romelman šek'ra jačvita bevraso'i, guelta up'ali, da daaba mtasa zeda, romel ars k'act šeuvallo". Armenian version (Thomson 1996, 16): "Abrition of whom they say that by magic he bound in iron bonds the lord of serpents called Biurasp".

66 wlabatrū hwē ašgan malka akal arbima wšubin šnia wlabatrū hwē d[ā]šmšid malka ašlimun malka br dawid qarilū akal alpa dšnia tšima barqa umia bišima wlabatrū hwē brūq malka.

67 Clearly, the name contains the Iranian word *šp-*: *Bēwarasp? *Xrudāsp?

68 A piece of Sasanian *agitprop* against Bahrām Cōbēn, which makes it possible to date this particular Mandæan passage.

69 Karkum is a demon, cf. Drower & Macuch 1963, 201b; his epithets in the Mandaic tradition leave no doubt that his name is a distortion of the original **karum*, **kurum* [assimilated into the older Judæo-Gnostic Giant pattern], the *Kirm*, "Worm", of Kārnāmag ī Ardašēr ī Pābagān [KNAP]; he was a

relative to *iasdis tabian*, who is Artaban (cf. Drower & Macuch 1963, 179a & 186b), the last Arsacid king; in KNAP the episodes of Artaban and Kirm are combined. It seems that in Sasanian Iran the older myth of Frēdōn's overcoming of Dahāg was doubled by a newer myth, that of the overcoming of *Kirm* by a Sasanian king [e.g., by Ardašēr].

70 wlabatrū hwē asdahag br aspag dbahran malka qarilū akal tlatma šnia wlabatrū hwē paridun br tibian malka akal arbima whamšin šnia wlabatrū hwē pašm nariman dāsrū qkarkum qarilū akal hamišma šnia.

priestly tradition of the Zoroastrian books as it is known now. The extant redaction of the short account of Dk 8.13.8-9 (DkM 689.6-10) [TEXT XXXIV], derived from the genealogical Cihrdād Nask, was clearly made after the Arab assault and the fall of Sasanian Iran and could hardly genuinely reflect the Sasanian version. It is not difficult to see how close this account is to Firdawsī's version. The only difference is that the poet made the father of the three daughters king of Yemen and did not tell us his name.

The king's name Pātsraw means something like "glorious"⁷¹ (in Sāh-Nāmah: Sarw), a proper name for a king⁷²; it was taken from a lost *Zand* to the Nask of Good Rule, a survival of which we find in Pvd 20.1, where Pātsraw is mentioned in a gloss: bahrōmandān [tuwānīgān ciyōn Pātsraw], "wealthy in portions (taxes) [rich like Pātsraw]", rendering Avestan yātāmamtām. In Dk 3.184 (DkM 197.17) Pātsraw is praised for his bahrō<man>dīh, "his endowment with a lot". One may suggest that the traditions derived from Y 51.1a and Vd 20.1 were combined. This person is mentioned for another time in "Sahrestānīhā ī Erān", § 50:

Ūš dašt ī Tāzīg pad xwēšīh ud āzādīh⁷³ bē ō Buxt-Xusraw ī Tāzīg šāh dād, paywand dārišn ī xwēš dād, "...and the Arabian Plain was given by him [by Frēdōn] into possession and inheritance to Buxt-Xusraw the Arabian king for the maintenance of his offspring".

Here, Buxt-Xusraw is a variant for Pātsraw, being perhaps derived from a popular tradition. The same popular tradition we find in another Sasanian text, namely, in "Day Hārōt of the Month Frawardēn" § 12-14, cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 100-1 [TEXT XXXV]. The passage seems to be pre-Islamic; it is reminiscent of Pvd 1.19 in the distinction it makes between Arabs (Tāzīg) and Turks (Avestan Taožiia-, Pahlavi Tōz), cf. Anklesaria 1949, 13. We have another reference to this Arabian king in a Dk passage where *ōdag, whatever the meaning here, is referred to: Dk 7.1.34 (DkM 597.19-598.3) [TEXT XXXVI]. There is thus

71 Cf. Justi 1895, 246a: "röhmlich".

72 Does it, in addition, contain a hint to the Arabic badw / bādī?

73 On the meaning, cf. Perikhanian 1968, 9-16; *ibid.*, 1973, 445-6; *ibid.*, 1983, 223-5, having compared, *i.a.*, with Armenian azatut'iwn, "heritage, inheritance" and ManMPrs ³(²)z²dy, "inheritance", and arguing that the meaning of āzād is broader, than just "free". This theory of Perikhanian was accepted by Nyberg 1974, 41. However, the reading "ābādīh", "cultivation", on which cf. Shaked 1974a, 239-245, is also possible.

sufficient evidence to conclude that the compiler[s] of the Pahlavi *Zands* have referred in their work to *many* texts.

Dk 9.21.8-9 begins with abar followed by an Infinitive, probably thus indicating that a new fragard of a *Zand* is quoted:

ud abar wānīdan ī Frēdōn Dahāg margēnīdan rāy wazr abar palīg⁷⁴ ud dil mastargēz zadan ud nē murdan ī Dahāg az hān zanišn ud pas pad šafšēr zadan ud pad fradom didīgar sidīgar zanišn az tan ī Dahāg was ēwēnag xrafstr waštan,

"and about the vanquishing of Dahāg by Frēdōn, wishing to destroy him with blows of the club on the nape of the neck, on his chest, on his skull, too, (but) Dahāg did not die from those blows. Then he smote him with (his) sword, and on the first, on the second, and on the third blow, many kinds of noxious creatures were bursting like a rain / turning out"⁷⁵.

This scene is the reverse reflection of one clearly reminiscent of the famous *Bull-Slaying Motif* in the Western Mithraism where a scorpion, a snake and a dog are seen near the dying Bull, from whose blood all the good things were produced. This motif finds a parallel in the events that took place in 2nd stage of creation (cf. Kreyenbroeck 1992, 60). In our text here, the world had not known any noxious creatures; they were not produced at an earlier stage when Ahriman was trying to produce his counter-creations; it was only after Yima's death that they sprung.

Yima was killed by Dahāg; his death surely was seen originally as a sacrifice of sorts, but drought and distress were caused as a consequence of this act; stopping of waters from flowing and of plants from growing ascribed to Ahriman in Y 13 (cf. Kreyenbroeck 1992, 62), but in our text they are actually the acts of Aži Dahāg (hēz ī awastar⁷⁶); good things must have been produce from Yima's body, but instead, Frēdōn is ordered not to kill Dahāg in revenge, lest worst things would be produced. As it is Dahāg's death that would produce noxious living creatures, he must be kept alive, to prevent greater harm to the world. According to the logic of the myth, it must be the [benevolent?] death of someone else that had produced the good living things. Indeed, a survival of this myth is to be found in Bd 6e.2, where we are told that some plants sprung from the limbs of the Bull. The text continues (Dk.9.21.10):

74 Cf. Henning 1946, 729.

75 A slightly different translation in Williams 1990, II, 223.

76 In Vd 13.51 it is stated that the udra- ("otter") killer produces drought and destruction of pastures, haēcō karānaoiti yaī auuastrom, glossed as hušk kunēd a.wastar [sahm].

guftan ī Dādār ī Ohrmazd ō Frēdon kūš mā kirrēnēh kē Dahāg cē agarēz
kirrēnēh Dahāg, purr ēn zamīg kunēd az gaz udarasag gaždom ud karbūg /
karbunag ud kasūg ud wazay. abāg ēwēnag ī bastan ī pad škeft band andar
grāntom pātīfrāh ī *zindān,

"(about) the speech of the Creator Ohrmazd to Frēdon, saying: "Do not saw⁷⁷ him who is
Dahāg, because if you do saw Dahāg, he will make the earth full of serpents (gaz), *otters
(udarasag), scorpions (gaždom), lizards (karbūg/karbunag), tortoises (kasūg) and
frogs (wazay)". (And about) the mode of binding him with awful fetters in the most severe
punishment of imprisonment".

This passage deserves a special attention, as it is modeled on certain *Zands* made from Avestan
originals. The question arises whether there was an Avestan *Vorlage*, and in this case we have
here a survival of a non-Zoroastrian myth, or we have here a blend of traditions derived from
different sources and arranged at a late date.

The translation "lizards" for karbūg/karbunag is used here only for convenience, as this
is indeed the meaning in Persian⁷⁸. A similar problem of a [pseudo-] zoological identification
one encounters also in the case of "otter"⁷⁹; an almost identical sequence one finds in Dk 7.4.60
(where the context is different), purr gaz udarasak ud karbūg ud pizdūg ud wazay,
translated by Molé 1967, 52-3, as *serpents reptiles, de lézards, de chareçons et de grenouilles*.
The glossar in Molé's edition of Dk 7 translates udarasak⁷⁹ (Molé 1967, 310, 158) *qui*
marche sur le ventre, referring also to our passage in Dk 9. The difference between the two lists
is that Dk 9 has "tortoises (kasūg)" where Dk 7 has "weevil (*chareçons*, pizdūg)", which
are graphically similar. The difficulty is that both beaver and otter are seen as Ohrmazd
creatures. It must be thus that some specific kind is meant here.

77 However, Frēdon transgressed the command of Ohrmazd, cf. PRDD 47.9 (Williams 1990, I, 170-
1, II, 78): ūš Frēdon haxt awēz Ohrmazd tar menīd ūš pad hān tar menīšnīn aš
Zarmān abar ōbast ūš tan ī xvēšēz pad kudēnag tuwān būd dāštan azāš sē gām tās
pērāmōn hamē petlī hēnd, "And he [Ohrmazd] instructed Frēdon; (but) he also despised
Ohrmazd, and for that contempt of his, Zarmān then fell upon him, and with a mallet (?) he was able
to keep his body three paces from him until those around him repented".

78 For Khwarazmian, cf. also Henning 1951, 45.

79 However, it is not impossible to see here a combination of rāsūg, "weasel", with udrag, "otter",
Avestan udra-.

As there are some canine species of *xrafstras*, there were perhaps some otter and beaver-like
xrafstras. Kapadia 1957, 324, observed that the texts seem to confuse "beaver", babrag, with
"otter / water-dog"⁸⁰. Indeed, the confusion might go back to a Pāzand gloss: the Avestan
udra-, "otter", looks very much the same as the Pahlavi babrag⁸¹; on the other hand, it may
be that babrag ī ābtīg was read as *bēwarāsp or *bēwar.az (cf. also Kapadia 1953,
324). In the passage in which a parallel list is found (PvD 14. 5 [TEXT XXXVII]) the Avestan
terms are rendered as follows:

ažinām udarō.θrašanām	ažt uđrasag
ažinām spakanām kahrpunānām	ažt sag karbūg
kasiapanām	kasūg
wazayanām dādmānītanām	wazay ī ābtīg ⁸² ;

AiW 387 translates udarō-θraša as *kriechend*; it regards uđrasag as an unreadable
combination of Pahlavi letters, glossed pad škamb dwārēd, "running-daevically on the
belly"; karbūg/karbunag (*ka[h]rpuna[g]) in Dk 9.21.10 is a transliteration of the
Avestan kahrpuna-, "cat", New Persian gurbah, found in PvD 14.5, where karbūg /
karp<un>ag is rendering *kahrpuna*-, which is aži.spaka-, "dog-serpent", Pahlavi aži ī
sag; zoologically very different animals are designated as *serpent- / dragon-like* or of *canine*
nature; it implies, i.e., that there are also canine *xrafstras*, an observation that reminds us again
of the dog and the serpent in the *Bull-Slaying Scene*. Other parallels are to be found in Bd 148.8-
10, cf. Zaehner 1955, 236 (esp. n.1) [TEXT XXXVIII]; another translation of Avestan
udarō.θraša- is ul.gazišn, as in PvD 18.73 [TEXT XXXIX].

There are some other parallels to the idea of letting loose noxious creatures over the earth,
cf., e.g., Bd 14.15 (the list is slightly different: gzdwm klbyš kšwk w wzg); some
parallels are to be found in PRDD 21, Williams 1990, I, 113ff.; transl. II, 45ff.; notes II, 169ff.,
and in Bd 22.10ff. It is Ahriman who takes the shape of a frog, dēs ī wazag⁸³, and the scene
just depicted in the Dēnkard passage seems to be an exactly reversed version of the Mithraic

80 Combining together *udra* and *sag*.

81 (ابراک). In Pashto, *Babrak* is used as a masculine personal name.

82 The Pahlavi text is corrupt here.

83 GrBd 39.11f, IndBd 8.6ff. [Ch.3], composite text in Widengren 1967, 338-9; cf. Benveniste 1932-
33; Zaehner 1955, 355-360.

Bull-Slaying Scene, not an echo of the Zoroastrianized version of the *bull-slaying* (itself being a development of the ancient myth); as a whole, the Dēnkar'd passage seems to be composed from elements taken from *Zands*.

Turning now to Dk 9.21.11-13, the passage as a whole seems to be a translation from Avestan, or is, at least, likely to have incorporated some lines, especially in § 12, taken from such a translation. Some mythical references cannot be identifiable.

The golden *sufra* of the Aži Dahāg must be that robbed by him from Yima (cf. Vd 2.6) whom he murdered. The Pahlavi *sōlakōmand* / *sūraxōmand*, "something hollow, having a hole", translates Avestan *sufra*m and *suwraya* in Vd 2.7, 18, 30. The Avestan word was frequently taken to mean "arrow" (e.g. AiW: "Pfeil")⁸⁴; in fact, however, Avestan has two words for "arrow", - iṣu- and tiyri-, but the Pahlavi languages do have *sərv*, *serv*, *sarv* (Waxr); *surv* (Munj); *surv* (Yidga), all meaning "a hole"⁸⁵; that makes possible to interpret the Avestan *suwra* as "something with a hole, with an eye", as the Pahlavi *Zand* does, with its *sūrāgōmand*, "having a hole", cf. New Persian *sūrāx* / *sūlāx*, "a hole". Thus our Avestan word must mean "a ring"⁸⁶, with Avestan *sūra*-, "a hole", and Afghan *sūrai*, *ibid.*, being variants. Nevertheless, in *our* Pahlavi context the word clearly means "trumpet"⁸⁷, not "ring". Tafazzoli 1977, 25-35, stressed that the meaning "something having a hole" > "trumpet" follows a Sasanian exegetic tradition. The later tradition kept this meaning: the versions dating from Islamic times have Persian *gāwdumb*, Arabic *mašārat* or *naḥr*, where Middle Persian has *sūrāgōmand*. Yima's *suḥrā*, *sufra* [in India Yama has his *nāgya*-] is the same word as Hebrew *šōḥar*, strange Syriac form *šīḡōrā* and Jewish Aramaic

84 After the Shughani *surb* "arrow", but according to Abayev 1984, 3, such a Shughani word is a ghost-entry.

85 Cf. Abayev 1984, 3 n. 12.

86 If "a ring" was the original - and known - meaning of the word, it has perhaps something to do with the "Seal of Solomon" in Jewish and Muslim legends; as well known, King Solomon and Jamšēd coalesced in folklore. Note the gloss to PhVd 2.6, where *sūrāxōmand* is found: *muhrag.dastag*, "a hand-seal". In Vd 2.30, 38 it is perhaps implied that the *vara* was sealed by *suwra*; however, the expression is obscure and it was from there that the idea of Dahāg's drawing people and wealth to himself was derived. It is of interest to note in passing that a similar notion is given in Велемир Хлебников's poem "Труба Гуль-Мулы". The "Avestan" sources of this Russian poet of the first quarter of this century deserve a special study.

87 Cf. Tafazzoli 1977; Duchesne-Guillemin 1979.

šippūrā / *šīḡōrā* (whence New Persian *šāpūr*), Arabic *sayfūr*; the Quranic *šūr* is an Iranian loan word, taken directly from the word continuing the Avestan lemma in question⁸⁸.

The blowing of a trumpet was regarded as an angelic act of deliverance in the Near East; it was perhaps under the impact of Yima's pastoral trumpet, so badly abused by Dahāg, that the notion of using it in proclaiming the final deliverance was developed. Yima's pastoral functions, and his title as "possessing good flocks" are to be compared to Mithra's appellative "possessing wide pastures". With his trumpet, Yima assembles human prototypes into his *vara*, a function comparable in the tradition (cf. WZs 35.2D) to those of the *Saošyants* who shall use *gāwdumb* or *naḥr*.

The Middle Persian rendering *sūrāxōmand* of the Avestan *sufra*-⁸⁹ is thus adequate⁹⁰. With Jews of the so-called "Intertestamental" period, Suriel, whose name was formed from the word continuing Avestan *sufra*-, became one of the four archangels⁹¹; in Qumran, the names of Suriel and Uriel frequently interchange. Suriel is the death angel with Ethiopian Beta-Israel⁹² ((Suryā), appearing in such works as "Death of Moses" and the [Christian] "Apocalypse of Baruch"⁹³) and Mandaeans (Suriel); Isra'īl of the Islamic tradition might represent a contamination with *šārāf*, "Seraphin"⁹⁴.

Pahlavi *xvāstag ī abāyisnīg (Dk 9.21.13) was translated by me here "desirable wealth", while the Arabic version [Text XL] rendered it more precisely, *qābbat* fārīha, "comely cattle"⁹⁵. It was the cattle requested by Dahāg to feed his snakes, as we know from *Sāh-Nāmah* and other sources. The only difference with the Pahlavi text is that in the Arabic version Dahāg has seven trumpets, while in the Dk text it is stated, too, that he ruled all over

88 Cf. Duchesne-Guillemin 1979, 545. The instrument's name occurs in the Middle Persian text "Xusraw ud Rēdag", §62, as *šūrdā*, *sūrāčtk*; Unvala 1917, 28, did not read it; Monchi-Zadeh 1982, 76 (and n. 98), reads *sur-pīk*, "Pandean flute"; *sūrā*, *sornā*, *sūrāy*, *zurna* are connected.

89 Still, we do not, actually, know what the Avestan meaning of the word was; it is possible that the original meaning "cup" (φύλη) survived in the Scythian myth reported by Herodotus, on which cf. Benveniste 1938.

90 Pace Bailey 1943, 219 n. 1.

91 Cf. Duchesne-Guillemin 1979; cf. also in Polotsky 1937.

92 Wrongly nick-named "Fafasas".

93 Cf. Leslau 1951, 165 n. 3; 181 n. 26.

94 As was observed by Caquot, quoted *apud* Duchesne-Guillemin 1979, 549.

95 In many language the shift "wealth" > "cattle" and vice versa is recorded; cf. English "cattle" from Middle Latin *cap[iti]tāle*, "la tête de bétail", Duchesne-Guillemin 1979, 542, or Arabic *ra's māi* etc.; as was noted above, Classical Georgian *xuastagi* means both "wealth" and "cattle".

the 7 kīšwars; the Pahlavi passage uses two different words for "women", [nēwag] carādīg and zan (Dk 9.21.12-13), for which the Arabic has jāriya ḥasana.

It seems that this was Dahāg himself who established fires to protect the horses of his own bad impact (Dk 9.21.15). However, Aži Dahāg was a good ruler in certain regards: he "acted in a mixed way" (pad gumēzag warzīd, Dk 9.21.16), and in Dk 9.21.18, the people came to Frēdōn complaining about his smiting of Aži Dahāg. The reason given by them is the protection given by him from the Māzandarānians. As far as I can see, this explanation is unique in the Pahlavi tradition. However, the tradition preserved with the Armenian [pseudo-] Movsēs Xorenac'i (cf. Thomson 1980) knows about this ambivalence of Aži Dahāg: Movsēs Xorenac'i mentions in his "From the Persian Legends ii" (end of Book I) the "maleficent benevolence", anbari barērarowt'iwn, of Biurasp Aždahak, which consisted of his giving up the royal ceremonies, especially that of *pardah / *hijāb⁹⁶: "he allowed his friends [barēkamacn] to come and go as freely at night as in the day. And this is his so-called first maleficent kindness" [translated in Thomson 1980, 128].

According to Xorenac'i, the real name of Biurasp (otherwise, with Xorenac'i, a fairly good transliteration of an Iranian form with an *pidāfah*: bēwarasp t aždahāk) was Kentaur Piwrida. Now, bēwar means "a myriad" (10 000), and asp means "a horse"; it was this association with horses that probably urged Dahāg to establish fires to protect these animals from his own affliction (Dk 9.21.15). The Greek Κενταυρος was a mythical equid, half-horse (*asp), half-man, thus we have a Greek "translation" transliterated into Armenian by Kentaur; as to Piwrida, this form is itself a Greek transliteration of bēwar >

*Βη/υ[α]πιδος. Why *δος became -da in Armenian, I cannot explain⁹⁷, but the alteration B/P is normal in Armenian dialects: in those of the West, close to the Greek-speaking areas, the Greek B in loan-words from this language was pronounced by the Armenians as their P. It seems that "the real name" (i.e., its Greek form; Xorenac'i often uses this expression when he wishes to equate some Oriental personage with its Greek counterpart) of Biurasp was taken from Western Armenians⁹⁸. To sum up: bēwar = Piwrida and asp = Kentaur. Xorenac'i's source was Greek, i.e., the Greek tradition knew of material derived from X'V adāy-Nāmag better than is generally accepted.

⁹⁶ On these, cf. Shaked 1982a.

⁹⁷ Otherwise, only if one presupposes an Aramaic intermediary.

⁹⁸ Compare now Hambartsumian 1998.

Here a new passage begins, combining extremely old historical-mythological material dating to the Iranian expansion into Western Iran⁹⁹ with mythologized historical traditions of the Late Sasanian period about the occupation of Yemen and the razzias of North-Caucasian nomads through Darband Pass¹⁰⁰.

This mythological account of the second part of Dk 9.21 (§§11-24) was introduced into the Avesta perhaps during the reign of the royal codifier of the Sacred Corpus Xusraw I Anōšurwān, 562-572, who occupied Yemen and repelled the nomads going on razzias via Northern Caucasus. Samrān is an old corruption for Humērān/Himērān (Syriac and Arabic Ḥimyar, Gē'ez Ḥēmēr, Greek Ὠμύρται)¹⁰¹, i.e., Himyar in Yemen called Hamāwarān (Firdawsī has Hamāwarān as well) in Middle Persian¹⁰². It is there (Sambarān / Hamāwarān) that Kay Kāos¹⁰³ was taken captive with all his army and freed by Rōstahm. The whole setting of the story is referred to in the already quoted Dk 8.12.13¹⁰⁴. This passage seems to blur up Yemen with a land in Māzandarān, perhaps, because the Sasanian¹⁰⁵ conquest of Yemen was carried out by the 800 Daylamite soldiers¹⁰⁶. Yemen was under Sasanian sway for a long time, and there are some indications that it was via Yemen (with Hīrah, Baḥrain and ʿOmān, too), that Iranian ideas, conceptions and loan words¹⁰⁷ entered the Arab world and the Arabic language¹⁰⁸, and it is Yemen / Māzandarān that ZWY 6.8 refers to. In the already quoted

⁹⁹ Cf. Burrow 1973.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Marquart 1901, 26ff., and Nöldeke 1915.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Marquart 1901, 26 n.1, Markwart & Messina 1931, 101ff. (cf. for variants, cf. also Bd 33.9; ed. Anklesaria, 212.10; 213.2).

¹⁰² The Mandæan Ginza Rabba has Bēθ Simrayē, Bēθ Sind, Bēθ Hindūwayē; cf. also Targum of Chronicles 1 1:9; sometimes Samaran was confused with Samarkand; the campaign to Māzandarān in Šāhnāmāh is secondary and based on Yemen, cf. Nöldeke 1915, 598 n. 3.

¹⁰³ But cf. also Dk 9.224, where he is said to ward off the Māzantīg [Māzandarānt] demons.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Chapter I. Appendix: hān t x'V ānīrah x'V adāy Frēdōn sraw pad wānīdan t Dahāg, zadan t Māzandarān seh ud baxtan t Xanīrah pad Salm ud Tōz ud Erič t-š 3 pus..., etc.

¹⁰⁵ Yemen was occupied, circa 562-572, by Xusraw I. Anōšurwān.

¹⁰⁶ As to Daylam / Samrān association with Frēdōn, it is to be noted that the cult of Frēdōn was current in Daylam, Minorsky 1983, 190b.

¹⁰⁷ Among some words regarded as Himyaritic in native Arabic dictionaries (cf. Belova 1987, 159) some are those recognized a long ago as Iranian (like *gōr*; *zbr*, "to write").

¹⁰⁸ On evaluation of the pre-Islamic Arabo-Persian relations, cf. Bausani 1971, 72. Texts in Pahlavi related to Jews and Judaism were lately assembled, in Shaked 1990a; it should be worth to assemble the Pahlavi texts dealing with Arabs.

Šahristānīhā ī Erān § 50 we read: Šahristān ī Samrān Frēdōn ī Aōšēnān kard
ūš *Ma[n]šūr¹⁰⁹ ī Samrān šāh ōzad ūš zamīg ī Samrān abāz ō xvēših ī
Erānšahr āwurd ūš dašt ī Tazīg pad xvēših ud āzādih bē ō Buxt-Xusrāw¹¹⁰ ī
Tazīg šāh dād, paywand dārišn ī xvēš dād,

"the town of Samrān was built by Frēdōn son of Aōšēn and he killed *Ma[n]šūr king of
Samrān, and he made the land of Samrān the property of Erān, and the Arabian steppes were
given by him into possession and inheritance to Buxt-Xusrāw the Arabian king for the
maintenance of his offsprings".

The name of this city / country was rightly connected (Nyberg 1964, 105) to an important
Dēnkard passage [TEXT XL]. This passage demonstrates the difficulties posed by some late
Pahlavi texts as the legendary stuff derived, sometimes, from non-Iranian sources, got
interwoven with genuine historical traditions.

This particular text was arranged lately after the Arab¹¹¹ onslaught, as indicated by the
reference to the Zoroastrian sage bearing a post-Sasanian title, a contemporary of al-Ma'mūn,
together with the Arabic name Xālid (if read correctly). Nabuchadnezzar¹¹² is here an Iranian
general, bearing a good Iranian name of Buxt-Narsēh¹¹³. According to the Arabo-Persian
tradition, Buxt al-Nasr (=Buxt.Narsēh) was a general of Luhrāsp¹¹⁴; the problem
whether the Arabic form Buxt al-Nasr has influenced, in the post-Sasanian epoch, the Iranian
Buxt-Narsēh, or the way around, cannot be solved here. However, if it was the Iranian form
which has influenced the Arabic one, and this seems not entirely impossible as the Arabic form
includes Buxt, an element looking all too much Iranian, and bearing in mind that the Arabic form

¹⁰⁹ However, Nyberg's reading of *Mēx-var for *Ma[n]šūr (Markwart & Messina 1931, 101-2) is
to be rejected.

¹¹⁰ I prefer the reading Buxt-Xusrāw rather than Baxt-Xusrāw. This is the reading in "The Day Hārōt
of the Month Frawardīn" § 14, Markwart & Messina 1931, 101. "The Day Hārōt of the Month
Frawardīn" was composed under Xusrāw II, circa 608 CE, cf. West 1904, 111.

¹¹¹ As Bausani 1971, 58, has noted, the Arabs were quite frequently mentioned in the texts dated from
the Sasanian Period and it is therefore wrong to think of the Moslem invasion as the first occasion on
which there was contact between Arabs and Persians.

¹¹² For this identification, cf. Gray 1904, Gray 1905, 465, Gray 1906, 189. The question of the
historicity of such an identification must not bother us here, as there is nothing historical about our text
(cmp. Shaked 1990a, 90).

¹¹³ One would speculate whether some memory of Mihr-Narsēh, the prime minister of Yazdgird II,
renowned for his refutation of the Christians, could be tracked down in this personage.

¹¹⁴ For sources cf. Tafazzoli 1364, 46 n. 1.

would rather reproduce a Syriac form if having been appeared in Arabic only after Islam, then,
one could perhaps speculate about some traces of Irano-Mesopotamian¹¹⁵ syncretism as at least
Nebuchadnezzar is concerned. Here, the evil Mesopotamian king is a general of Wištāsp's
father, who went to conquer Jerusalem. Jerusalem was mentioned also in MX 26.64-6 [TEXT
XLII], under another name.

This text taken from the Mēnōg ī Xrad, generally held to be a Sasanian composition¹¹⁶,
unlike our Dēnkard passage, does not mention any general of Luhrāsp. It is the Kayanian king
himself who performed the deeds generally attributed to Nebuchadnezzar. Jerusalem is designated
as a "Jewish" city, not as a Byzantine one, which bears in Dk 5.1 a clearly Arabic name of Baytā
Maqdis¹¹⁷, and its name is in accordance with the Aramaic tradition¹¹⁸. The Mēnōg ī Xrad
passage must be, then, a product of a late Sasanian pseudo-historiography¹¹⁹. The passage in
question has nothing to do with the liberation of Jerusalem from the Byzantine yoke in 614 CE:
the situation then was completely different, the Jews saw Persians as liberators, Jerusalem was
not Jewish in any political sense, and the Jews were not dispersed by the Persians - there were
rather the Christians who were oppressed by the Persians and Jews¹²⁰.

¹¹⁵ I use here "Mesopotamian" in the most vague sense. It might include Jewish, Christian-Aramaic and
genuine Assyro-Babylonian traditions. Shaked 1987 and Shaked 1990 spoke of *les mages sémitiques* and
these two terms would be overlapping.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Tafazzoli 1992, 554-5.

¹¹⁷ Against the Hebrew *Bēṭ ha-Miqdāš or the Syriac *Bēṭ Maqdāš; the vowel after Bayt- must
represent, in a distorted form, the Arabic definite article al-. This combination of the post-Sasanian
Arabic name (perhaps, erroneously and anachronistically Aramized?) with the attribution to the city to
the Byzantine Empire is typical for all this Dk 5.1 passage.

¹¹⁸ It would be better *Ūrūš'īm, however. But the difference is small and could be easily explained
by many factors, which have not to bother us here.

¹¹⁹ On the other hand, unlike in our Dk passage, where Jerusalem is called "Byzantine", reflecting the
actual political situation of the early years of the 7th century, our MX text calls Jerusalem "Jewish",
clearly, under the impact of the later Islamic tradition. The conclusion is that the word "Jewish" is a
post-Sasanian gloss.

¹²⁰ Jews generally welcomed the Persian troops, according to a long history of Persophile attitudes.
Byzantine sources stress the point of Jewish defectors. In 609 the Jews of Antioch revolted, they killed

the Patriarch and helped Persians in the next year to seize the city. In 610, the Jews of Tyre (4,000
strong) revolted, though unsuccessfully. In the Land of Israel the Jews counted 10 % to 25 %, especially
in the Galilee. Led by Benjamin of Tiberias, Jewish insurgents opened the way to Caesarea, the capital of
the province. It seems that the Persians promised to give Jerusalem back to the Jews. When in 614 the
city fell, Sahrāwāz established in it a sort of Jewish administration. A Jew accepted the name
Nechemia and tried to re-establish the sacrifices. Many Christians were cruelly killed during the war,
with Jews taking a vivid part in these killings; many others were sold by Jews as slaves. There are
sources telling as that the Jews killed the slaves who refused to convert to Judaism. Corpses were
prohibited to be buried. However, in 617 the Jewish administration of Jerusalem was abolished and
again, the Jews were prohibited to settle in Jerusalem. In 629-30 the Byzantines returned. In 628 the
Emperor gave an amnesty to the Edessan Jews, and so in Tiberias. In Jerusalem first the collaborators,
and then all the Jews were persecuted. Many Jews, including Benjamin of Tiberias, converted to
Christianity. In 632 all the Jews in the Empire were ordered to convert.

The Persians destroyed all the churches in Palestine except one - the Church of the Nativity -, where they rightly identified the adoring Magi on the frescos as their compatriots wearing Sasanian garb¹²¹. Thus, the Mēnōg ī Xrad passage was composed ante 614 CE, while the Dēnkard passage, depending on it (or, on a closely associated tradition) reflects some knowledge of the Last Sasano-Byzantine War¹²².

In the light of all this evidence, one has to draw the conclusion that the tradition of sacking Jerusalem by an Iranian king (or, his general) was known in Iran prior 614 CE; this tradition was a part of the late Sasanian polemic against the proselytizing Judaism; it was provoked by the Jewish tradition of Cyrus, thus implying that this Jewish tradition was known to the Iranian priests-scribes. As Shaked 1990a, 90, noted, the idea of the synthesizing history as known from the Arabo-Persian sources is not a product of the period of these sources, but a heritage from the Sasanian era, and in this context of a synthesized popular Irano-Mesopotamian pseudo-historiography, the suggestion of Buxt al-Naṣr's being influenced by the earlier Buxt.Narsēh, makes better sense.

If so, although our Dēnkard passage is, as was said above, far later than the Mēnōg ī Xrad passage, the notions of Luhrāsp's or Buxt.Narsēh's destroying Jerusalem might be two parallel, and Sasanian, traditions.

The strange thing about Dk 9.21 is that this chapter, being a *midrashic* commentary on the Yasna of Good Rule, gives us no examples of a model ruler; it consists of an account of a good king who ward off the evil and ruled over the whole world, but was slain by another king, actually, a tyrant, whose deeds were a mixture of good and evil; this one also ruled over the whole world. Later he was overcome by a hero, Frēdōn, whose lordship expanded only as far as the Continent of X^vanīrah, i.e., Iran only.

He expelled those of the Māzandarān country who tried to seize the Continent of X^vanīrah, i.e., Iran, and it is even stated (Dk 9.21.24) that some people of Māzandarān came later to X^vanīrah, i.e., Iran, in search of wisdom. It is difficult not to see here a description of the Late Sasanian conditions, when the hopes to restore the rule of the kings of old of the Continent of X^vanīrah over the *oecumene* evaporated and the rulers of Iran were forced to content with what they had. The coming of spiritual chiefs of Māzandarān to Iran in search of wisdom must be interpreted as a reference to the spread of Zoroastrianism into far-flung areas, somewhere

¹²¹ Cf. Russell 1990-91, 143-4.

¹²² The Sasanian wish to reconquer Syria and Egypt, the lost Achemænian provinces in the West appeared almost immediately after the new dynasty has arisen, cf. Lettre de Tansar, 548.

outside the borders of Sasanian Iran, and also probably as a hint to the legend of the Avesta dispersed amongst the nations after Alexander's onslaught. The Good Rule in the Sasanian political philosophy was held to be the guidance of the Lord Wisdom. The nations not ruled by the Zoroastrian Law were doomed to suffer from the, politically, Bad Rule, as DkM 25.15 [TEXT XLIII] may well indicate. This passage is seen as reflecting the Uigur (called plainly "Turks") Manichæism¹²³, and as one of the few non-Muslim sources to make note of Khazar Judaism¹²⁴. It would be better for the Byzantines and the Turks, from the Sasanian point of view, to convert to Zoroastrianism and to be ruled by the Sasanian Good Rule¹²⁵.

Though it was stated in a text (MX 21.25-6 [Text XLIV]), which refers to Sasano-Byzantine and Sasano-Turkish wars (cf. Tafazzoli 1992, 555) that these enemies of the Sasanian Good Rule (*ēfih) shall convert only after the Renovation takes place, nevertheless, this passage implies that the enmity between the descendants of the three sons of Frēdōn will come one day to an end, though it is not clear in which way: by reconciliation or by destruction of the Byzantines and the Turks. It seems, however, that, as there were hardly any theoretical objections to spread Zoroastrianism¹²⁶ among, at least, the Turks (AJ 12.8-9 & 15 [Text XLV]), that the first possibility is the likely one¹²⁷. In principle, a Sasanian general should first invite the enemies to embrace Zoroastrianism before he begins to wage a war (Dk 8.26.21-22 [Text XLVI]). In the post-Sasanian composition Sāh ī Wahrām¹²⁸ [Text XLVII] even the "demons" of Māzandarān, together with the most of the nations known to Iranians, are said to have been converted, in the future, by military force of the triumphant Savior. Non-adherence to Zoroastrianism was necessarily seen as leading one to ultimate destruction in the afterlife, cf. Šāyast nē šāyast 6.7: Kay.Ādur.bōzēd guft kū agdēn ka tanāpuhl ēw kirbag weš kū wināh az dušax^v bōxtēd, "Kay.Ādur.bōzēd said that an infidel, when his merit is one tanāpuhl more than his sin(s), is saved from hell" (Tavadia 1930, 97).

¹²³ Cf. de Menasce 1947a, 240.

¹²⁴ Cf. Golden 1984, 140 n. 38.

¹²⁵ Theoretically, Iran was supposed to extend its borders. The problem arising then was to be dealt with, cf. DkM 748.13-15 (Shaki 1974, 334): abar madan ī zamīg, x^vāstāg ud ciš ī anērān dāšt ō <w>āspuhragān x^vēšīh ī yak az Erān, "On the coming of land, property or anything, held by foreigners, into the private (absolute) ownership of one of Iran".

¹²⁶ In Sāhpuhr's times, but not in those of Kerdīr, some non-Iranian areas were designated as Iran, Gignoux 1987b.

¹²⁷ Al-Bakrī, ca. 1094, noted that the King of the Khazars previously was a majūsī, "pagan", perhaps "a Zoroastrian", cf. Golden 1984, 142.

¹²⁸ To be dealt with in details in Chapter IV.

Conversion to the State religion was by no means a theoretical problem in Sasanian Iran; on the contrary, it was a topic of vivid practical interest. We read thus in the Sasanian *Hērbedistān* 12 (cf. Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992, 20-1):

"... On the wife and children of a man who comes to the faith. On the estate of a deceased foreigner who has accepted Zoroastrianism. On a woman who dies shortly after embracing Zoroastrianism. On relations between Zoroastrian men and non-Zoroastrian women. On non-Zoroastrians who come to Iran to seek refuge¹²⁹."

Both Judaism and Zoroastrianism are originally communal religions with a universalist potential. Found itself in two multinational empires, Judaism did realize, to a great degree, this potential, working on man-to-man basis. That is how entire populations were converted to Judaism in the Roman Empire. On the contrary, Zoroastrianism was congested by the political borders of the Sasanian State. The stateless Judaism, having no means of enforcement, chose to convert the entire known humanity, i.e., peoples of the Mediterranean; the state-backed Zoroastrian priests preferred to convert, sometimes by force, the subjects of the King of Kings, demanding from them both political and religious loyalty, leaving the hopes of the universal conversion of the humanity to the Last Days.

129 Such refugees were, e.g., the members of the "Greek Academy" established in Gundēšāhpūr, which lasted into Islamic times, after Justinian closed in 529 the Academy at Athens.

CHAPTER III

STRANGE *Zand* TRADITIONS

In this Chapter, some *Zand* traditions will be studied which reveal interaction between various *Zand* texts and its different layers.

Sleep and Sweat

Here we will turn to an old, though seemingly solved, problem, in which both textual and theological aspects are confined. My main interest here is to show the *Zandist* at work, demonstrating, at the same time, the textual "global history" of a number of Pahlavi passages.

In Bd 1a.13b [TEXT I] Ohrmazd created "Sleep" and brought it forth to the First Man Gayōmard, so that he might suffer less from the onslaught of Ahriman: ũš (Ohrmazd) dād ō ayārīh xʷāb āsānīh.dādār, cē Ohrmazd hān xʷāb frāz brēhēnīd, "He created the repose-giving Sleep¹ to (Gayōmard's) assistance, for Ohrmazd created forth this Sleep...". However, this passage may be an interpolation, whether into the Bd text, or into its *Vorlage*, presumably, the Dāmdad Nask (cf. MacKenzie 1989b, 549). The reason for this assumption is that while the creation of Gayōmard is referred to in Bd 1a.13a, after the statement quoted above (Bd 1a.13b) one reads:

"... and He created Gayōmard and the Bull from the earth". It seems to me also important, before we turn to the notion of "Sleep", to make a short remark on the definition of xʷāb as āsānīh.dādār. This is found also in Dk 9.21.3², the text dealing with the whereabouts of another Iranian mythological First Man, namely Yima, and an Avestan substratum was looked for. Unfortunately, we do not possess Dk 9.21.3 in the original Avestan; āsānīh.dādār and kāmāg.dādār³ used there are clearly translations from Avestan, as was noted by Molé 1959, 284 nn. 5-6; the original Avestan for āsānīh.dādār was probably *"one who put peace", with āsānīh rendering *šīiāti or the like. The Pahlavi text of Dk 9.21.3 is as follows:

¹ So also Anklesaria 1956, 27; Zaehner 1955, 320: "sleep, the repose of the Creator". Cf. Dk 9. 21.3. "Bead of sleep" (xew) appears in the Kurdish version of Lailī & Majnūn (cf. Rudenko 1965, 15-7), in a rather similar function.

² Cf. Chapter II, Appendix I [TEXT XIX] pp. 83-4.

³ *kāmāg.dādārīh, glossed by nēwagīh and sub-glossed frārdīh, is clearly "good desire"; kāmāg generally renders vaīrīā and, in its turn, is frequently glossed by nēwagīh.

ud ēnəz kū: "āsānTh.dādār būd Jam [kū.š ciš hān kard ī mardomān āsānTh
azāš būd] ud kāmag.dādār" [kū.š nēwagTh pad dād šnāyēnīdārīh; kū.š mardom
pad frārōnTh ōh šnāyēnīd],

"And this, too, that Yima was creator of ease [i.e., he made things by which people are at ease] and
creator of will/desire [i.e., goodness through the pleasing of the law; i.e., he pleased people
through righteousness/for he taught people righteousness]".

This parallel between the two texts is worth consideration, though one cannot draw decisive
conclusion from such meagre evidence. In another Bd text, namely, Bd 1.53 [TEXT II], Sleep
(x^vāb) is created by Ohrmazd Himself as the 17th among His very significant creations: 13th
Rašn, 14th Mihr, 15th Aršīšwang, 16th, Pārand, 17th Sleep, 18th Wād (the Wind), ... ,
20th Quarrel, Prosecution, (legal) Defence and Peace of Bounty (Paykār, Pēšēmālīh,
Pasēmālīh ud Aštīh ī Abzōnīgīh). This should provide Sleep with what may be called
"archangelic" position, though the proximity to the ambiguous Wād (who, in its turn, sounds
too close to Wāy) and to No. 20 (Quarrel, Prosecution) makes Sleep a bit suspect. Though
opposed to būšāsp, "(the demon of) sloth"⁴, nevertheless, Sleep, first created by Ohrmazd, is
said to be defiled by demons, like everything else (fradom x^vāb⁵ pad dahišn dād... ud
awēz dēwān āhōgenīd ciyōn..., Bd 19.1 [TEXT III]); the following description (to which I
will return) of Sleep rather strengthens the mixed feelings about it and one can hardly avoid the
impression that what is described in Bd 19 is rather some būšāsp-like demon⁶.

It may also be added that putting Sleep in the "archangelic" context may imply that it was
supposed to possess some visible form, to which we shall return further.

But in DKM 837.15 it was demons who caused Gayōmard to sleep. This second version has to
do, in some way, with the Gnostic dimension of Sleep, maybe touched by Genesis 2.21⁷.

⁴ On it in later Judaeo-Persian texts, cf. Asmussen 1974.

⁵ TD2: xwyh xwyb.

⁶ By popular etymology, the word būšāsp should be analyzed as containing the element "horse" (though
it does not: Avestan būšīiāsta-); compare the description of Sleep in Bd 19.2 as a stallion trying to
rape both women and men. In Zoroastrian texts būšāsp, "sloth", and (good) Sleep became
interchangeable, as in the example quoted in Asmussen 1974, 239 (PY 62.5): kū tā.m tēz az būšāsp
bē tuwānād būdan, "in order that I can quickly be (awake) from sleep", where there is no negative
context. The opposite, probably, happened in Bd 19.

⁷ Cf. also Bd 1a.13b: "created from earth".

The version of the myth recorded there (Dk 9.32.7-10 [TEXT IV]), supposedly part of the lost
commentary on Y 32, is worth quoting: ... ēg ō hān ī man Gayōmard hān ī dēwān
dād x^vēy frāz mad pad bēš ī hān ... ud ka az hān x^vēy frāz būd asāyag būd
kū tārtīgTh andar mad būd ..., "Then the sweat created by demons came on to My
Gayōmard, to harm him ... And after he went forth from this sweat, he became shadowless, for
the darkness came in ... " (Dk 9.32.9-10). In the version of Dk 9.32 we find that the sweat
(x^vēy) was created by demons, while in Bd 1a.13b "Ohrmazd created... the Sleep (x^vāb)
..., for Ohrmazd created forth this Sleep...".

The word translated here as "sweat" was explained a long time ago as a corruption of the word
for "sleep" or as a homonym of it. Schaefer 1926, 217 n. 1, 351ff., explained this strange
notion as a result of a textual error, stating that the same spelling of "sleep" and "sweat" may
have been the source of confusion in the interpretation of the Gayōmard myth.

Later, Tafazzoli 1990, 53-4, postulated x^vēy as another Pahlavi word for "sleep",
homonymous with the word for "sweat". However, as x^vāb and x^vēy look very similar in the
Pahlavi script, one should rather suppose that the scribes would make an effort to distinguish
between two homonymous or similar words. Pahlavi has numerous words for "sleep", x^vāb,
x^vamn/x^vamr (and x^vēy, postulated by Tafazzoli); besides, it has the luxury of using
Aramæograms: one could spell it simply HLM to avoid discrepancy!

Three remarks should be made here:

- 1), in several cases in which the word for "sleep" was used in the context of creation, it seems as
if the scribes made efforts on purpose to blur them even more; in Bd (Pāzand x^vay), e.g., the
similarity goes so far that Anklesaria 1956 adopted the transcription kh^vēp; Tafazzoli 1990 and
Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993 (e.g., p. 170 n. 32; p. 436 etc.) adopted the form x^vē{y} [xwē
hwy] for "sleep"; in Bd 19.1 (TD2 128.11) the reading is, actually, hwyh hwyb, two
alternative forms used together, the second one being perhaps a gloss to the first one;
- 2), it should be observed that the context of our Dk 9.32.10 passage ("he went forth from...",
"shadowless"⁸, the appearing of darkness) suggests rather *x^vāb, "sleep", than x^vēy,
"sweat", and I believe the reading x^vāb, "sleep", was the original one, only to be corrupted later

⁸ Compare Theopompus' statement in Plutarch, Isis and Osiris 370C; on the notion of "shadow" in
Zoroastrianism, cf. now de Jong 1995 [1997].

to x^vēy, "sweat". "Sleep", unequivocally, is also the meaning in the Bd passages⁹, though there the whole notion is different;

3), it is worth noting that our (Dk 9.32.9-10) passage has no support in the extant PY, while the passages before and after it have abundant references to PY 32. This should be expected, as Y 32 (and its Pahlavi version, of course) speaks of *Yima*, another Iranian First Man, not of *Gayō marəta-/Gayōmard*, and our references to "sleep" and "sweat" in Dk 9.32.9-10 are but an interpolation from a source other than PY 32.

The conclusion should be that the versions of Gayōmard's sleep/perspiration have their origin not in a corrupt text of PY, as no such a text exists, but rather that they represent two independent (but later contaminated) traditions. These traditions were mutually attracted by some linguistic reality (phonetic and graphic similarity of a pair of words for "sleep" and "sweat").

"Sweat" was certainly characterized as a kind of fluid in the Sasanian Avesta. Similarly to the typology of Fires which, indeed, one finds in Bd 18¹⁰, such division of fluids into different types could have easily found its way into the Bundahishn. The context in which "sweat" is mentioned in the lists of fluids in PY 38 [TEXT V] and Bd 11b (cf. notes to [TEXT V]) has nothing in common with the context of Dk 9.32 / PY 32. No perspiration of the First Man is mentioned, as might be expected, and both groups of texts are unconnected in this respect.

There is no need to stress the point that in this particular case, namely in PY 38.3, the Pahlavi version has very little in common with what was supposed to be its Avestan original. This absence of evidence should obviously strengthen the feeling that no perspiration of the First Man was mentioned in the Pahlavi texts, and that the word in question must be read "sleep".

However, we should ask ourselves whether an average Pahlavi reader (or, hearer), seeing (or, hearing) the "text" speaking of Gayōmard's hwy / x^vēy thought of "sleep" or of "sweat/perspiration". The evidence of the Pahlavi MSS, with their stubborn spelling hwy, rather suggests that many Zoroastrians could have been led to believe that Gayōmard perspired, rather than that he fell into a coma (on the contrary, we should give a high mark to the (sources of? redactor of?) Bd 1 with its x^vāb which is a gloss to hwy). The notion that Gayōmard's creation had something to do with perspiration was preserved by authors who wrote in Arabic, thus reflecting, no doubt, a popular tradition.

⁹ Though, e.g., Christensen 1918, 16, took Bd 19 as speaking of sweat.
¹⁰ Cf. below: "Fire".

So, Ibn Abī- l-Ḥadīd, quoted in Shaked 1993a, 234 n. 45, wrote:

wa-yaz'umūna anna mabda'a takawwunihī wa-ḥudūṭihī anna Yazdān ...
 afkara fī amrī Ahriman ... fikratan awjabat an 'araqa jabīnuhu fa-masaḥa
 al-'araqa wa-ramā bihi fa-ṣāra minhu Kayūmarō,
 "they claim that the origin of the formation [of Kayūmarō] and his coming into being was that
 Yazdān ... reflected in the matter of Ahriman a thought which made his forehead sweat. He wiped
 the perspiration and cast it, and Kayūmarō was formed from it".

A similar tradition was known long ago from Bīrūnī (Aḥār, ed. Sachau 1923, 99.7)¹¹. It seems that "once "sleep" was misread as "perspiration", it was removed to the stage of creation, where it seemingly made better sense" (Shaked 1989, 247).

The crucial text is, however, Y 44.5, where the word for "sleep" appears. Its Pahlavi version [TEXT Via] is not of a great interest (though there, too, one finds x^vēy as a variant reading to x^vāb). DkM 852.8-17 [TEXT Vīb] is a late text drawing upon different sources (e.g., such notions common in Yašt, as "this creation of Mine, full of all kinds, was excepted from old age and immortal, O Zoroaster!, during 3000 years there was no hunger and thirst, and no sleep of the body [x^vēy tan] and no vigilance, no old age and no death, and no cold wind and no hot (wind)", between them, it is true, PY 44.5 ("sleep and the vigilance" in both PY 44.5 and the Dēnkard passage).

In hwy of DkM 852.11,16, Tafazzoli 1990, 52, n. 45, saw x^vēy, *x^vafya-, "sleep, dream" (mythological), derived perhaps from Avestan x^vafna- of Y 44.5. No doubt, he was right, as the word is used in the Dk passage in the contexts corresponding to Y 44.5; even more, the whole idea of Gayōmard's sleep and waking up in the creation story seems to have been derived from the

¹¹ wa qad qālū fī mabda'i l-'ālamī aqāwīa kaṭratan 'ajībātān wa fī tawallūdi
 Ahriman wa huwwa iblīs min fikratī-LLāhī ... fa'anna-LLāha taḥayyera fī amrī
 Ahriman fa'ariqa jabīnuhu wa masaḥa ḥālika wa ramā bihi fa-ṣāra minhu Kayūmarō,
 "They have told many fascinating legends about the beginnings of the world and about the birth of
 Ahriman, who is the Satan, from a thought of God ... and that God was perplexed in the matter of
 Ahriman, and His forehead sweated; He wiped it (the perspiration) and cast it, and Kayūmarō
 was formed from it". The translation is mine; cmp. Sachau 1879, 107.

same Gāōic verse¹², which was interpreted, in a *midrashic* way, as referring to Gayōmard. We cannot state that what this Gāōic verse treats was an allusion to Gayōmard's story; I would rather believe that the story was invented to explain the Gāōic verse, and the existence of the "perspiration version" seems to imply that the *midrash* given in DkM 852 and its relation to Y 44.5 was not common knowledge¹³.

It should be observed that our bothering word for "sleep / sweat" appears in all its occurrences in contexts where Ahriman has some rôle to play (especially in the Bundahišn account and in the Arabic versions). This observation may lead one to suggest that in the original story x^vafanā had to do with Ōhrmazd and Ahriman rather than with Ōhrmazd and Gayōmard (note also the above mentioned remark of Shaked and the fact that our Arabic sources connect their notion of "perspiration" with Ōhrmazd's perplexity "in the matter of Ahriman").

If one turns to the highly problematic Y 30.3a, where (supposingly) Ōhrmazd and Ahriman, beside x^vafanā, the Avestan forerunner of hwy, appear, one reads: aṭ tā mainiīd pouruiīd yā yāmā x^vafanā asruuātām, which the Pahlavi version rendered as follows:

ēdōn hān ī har dō mēnōg [Ōhrmazd ud Gannāg] ēšān fradom hān ī jumāy x^vad srūd [kūšān wināh ud kirbag x^vad bē guft],

"thus these both spirits [Ōhrmazd and Gannāg], they praised themselves together in the beginning [*i.e.*, they pronounced their own sin and merit]".

The text as a whole will be dealt with later [cf. below, "Ariš and Mahmī"], now we should only note that x^vafanā, generally rightly rendered as x^vāb, "sleep, dream", was rendered here, and only here, as x^vad, "himself".

Were the myth about the sleep of Gayōmard known to the Zandist(s) of Y 30.3a in the form we know it now from the Bundahišn account, one cannot think of better place to insert it than in PY 30.3a. I can imagine, as a rendering of the Avestan line aṭ tā mainiīd pouruiīd yā yāmā x^vafanā asruuātām, a version like this:

*ēdōn hān ī har dō mēnōg [Ōhrmazd ud Gannāg] ī pač Yim [ēwag gōwēd hān ī Gayōmard būd] x^vāb / x^vē srūd [kūšān abar Gayōmard x^vāb / x^vē āwurd hēnd; ēwag x^vāb ī nēwāg, ēwag x^vāb ī būšasp ī marnjēntōdār],
 "thus these both spirits [Ōhrmazd and Gannāg] were renown for Yima's [there is one who says it was Gayōmard] sleep / perspiration [*i.e.*, they brought upon Gayōmard sleep / perspiration; one (brought upon) a good sleep, one the murderous sloth-sleep]".

However, the Zandist(s) did not use this option, perhaps, because the equation of Yima and Gayōmard seemed to them untenable, or for some other doctrinal reason. The fact remains that x^vafanā was not translated here as "sleep".

To sum it up, the episode in question in the version of Dk 9.32 has no support in the Pahlavi Yasna and is an import from a text similar to one which was the source of the Bd version of the event. These proto-versions were however not identical. Their tendencies, on the contrary, were opposite. This conclusion implies that the notion of the sleep brought upon Gayōmard was known from a non-Avestan source (pre-Zoroastrian? Semitic?). Now, some texts should be compared in order to illustrate what form the Sleep was held to possess.

In Bd 19.2 Sleep is given the form of a 4 or 5 year old stallion (asp karb ī gušn ī 4 - ayāb 5 - sātāg), a description which "sounds Yaštic". His behavior towards both females and males implies lewdness. If we compare it to other "forms" in which Sleep appears (cf. further), and combine them with the maleness of Sleep in Bd 19.2 and his appearance before both females and males, one cannot help being reminded of the 15-year old Manichæan Neryōsang¹⁴, appearing before both female and male demons in order to cause them to perform some acts of basically sexual character (ejaculation, *i.e.*, non-productive issue of semen, and what was seen as its female counterpart, abortion). The parallel passages are:

¹² Exactly as Bd 1 as a whole was based on a Zand to Y 44.

¹³ Perhaps, on the contrary, the "perspiration version" preserves the older myth which was Zoroastrianized in the "sleep version".

¹⁴ In whose name the element "male" is obvious, cmp. the repeating "male form" in our passages. On Neryōsang in Manichæism, cf., e.g., Cumont 1908, 61-62; Benveniste 1932, 185.

Bd 1a.13b [TEXT I]: Ohrmazd hān xʷāb frāz brēhēnīd pad mard karb ī buland ī 15-sālag ī rōšn, Ohrmazd created this sleep in the form of a 15 years old tall luminous male,

Bd. 19.1 [TEXT III]: kū fradom xʷāb pad dahišn dād pad mard karb 15-sālag ī spēd dōīsr, first He created Sleep in the creation, in the form of a 15 years old male, with shining/bright eyes,

Wzs 2.10 [TEXT VII]: Ohrmazd xʷē brēhēnīd pad mard karb ī 15-sālag ī rōšn ī buland, Ohrmazd created Sleep in the body of a man, tall and bright, 15 years old,

Bd 4.22 [TEXT VIII]: kēš brēhēnīd Ohrmazd hān xʷāb pad mard tan ī gušn ī 15-sālag ī rōšn ī buland, Ohrmazd created Sleep in the male body of a man, tall and bright, 15 years old.

Bd 1a.13b and Wzs 2.10 represent basically the same text (as Wzs and Bd 1a are based on the same source), with adjectives put in inverse order; Bd 4.22, though close to both Bd 1a.13b and Wzs 2.10, has two important deviations from their tradition: 1), it has gušn, the word which has more masculine (even bestial) connotations than the plain mard, though mard is also used by it, so, pleonastically, we have "the male body of a man" here; 2), it has tan, "body", instead of karb, "form" (karb and tan are interchangeable also in the contexts of Fire). Bd 19.1 represents another tradition, in which the emphasis is put on "shining eyes", an expression with an obvious Avestan substratum (such substratum could be looked for also in Bd 4.22 with its tan and, especially, gušn). It is curious that while Bd 19.1 Sleep was "created in the form of a 15 years old male, with shining/bright eyes", in the next paragraph (Bd 19.2) Sleep is given "the equid form of a 4 or 5 years old stallion, [which] goes after females, and he even reaches after males, from the top of the head to the knees, and he remains for as long as..." [TEXT III], where obviously two different traditions were mechanically combined; the wording of Bd 4.22 [TEXT VIII]: kēš brēhēnīd Ohrmazd hān xʷāb pad mard tan ī gušn, "Ohrmazd created Sleep in the male body of a man", may be an abbreviated echo of Bd 19.1 and Bd 19.2-3: "he (Sleep) was not created with a body.... for every man has in his own being something like Sleep".

In the Zoroastrian myth as reflected in the sources, Gayōmar'd's sleep/perspiration was a necessary stage preceding Gayōmar'd's death (another, though textually problematic, reference to "sleep" in the context of "death" one finds in Wzs 30.32-30 [TEXT IX]) and his ejaculation; from Gayōmar'd's semen fallen into the earth a rhubarb grew, which became the first human couple (cf. e.g., Bd 6F.8-9; Bd 14.2-7; Wzs 3.71-72). It is worth quoting here a passage from Bd 14.5-6:

ka Gayōmar'd andar bē widērišnīh tōhm bē dād, hān tōhm pad rōšnīh ī xʷaršēd bē pāld hēnd, ūš dō bahr Neryōsang nigāh dād, ud bahr ēw Spēdarmet padīrīft ud cehel sāī andar zamīg būd. pad bawandagīh ī cehel sāī, rēwās karb ... Mašyē ud Mašyānē az zamīg abar rust hēnd,

"When Gayōmar'd, while passing away, ejaculated his semen, they filtered this semen through the light of Sun, Neryōsang kept two parts of it, and Spēdarmet (the [female] Earth) accepted one part, and for forty years it was in the Earth. After completion of forty years, Mašyē and Mašyānē (first human couple)¹⁵ grew up from the earth in the form of a rhubarb".

Mašyē and Mašyānē are, of course, (the hermaphrodite?) Gayōmar'd split into two; even the names of all three of them contain the same element of "mortality"; the Manichaean version (the so-called "Seduction of the Archons") which is merely a sarcastic parody of the Zoroastrian myth, possesses all the components of the latter: abortion and ejaculation (one single ejaculation split into two, as Gayōmar'd was split into Mašyē and Mašyānē; note that in the Manichaean version, there is no Mašyē, only Gayōmar'd = Adam and Mašyānē = Eve); Neryōsang (split into two, Neryōsang proper and his female assistant Sadwēs, who stands instead of Spēdarmet); creation of plants (cmp. "rhubarb") from the semen, the semen/light link.

It seems to me highly important that Bd 4.23 puts Sleep in a context of astronomic revolution (gardīšn) and the war of "giant demons" (Māzīgān dēwān) with the Signs of Zodiac (kō[x]šīšn ī abāg axtarān), both latter notions easily recalling of the Manichaean myth in question. It was perhaps this astral aspect of the battle connected with Gayōmar'd's death that provoked the substitution of Spēdarmet by Sadwēs [cf. APPENDIX II Sadwēs].

¹⁵ For graphic presentations of the forms of the names of Mašyē & Mašyānē with some of the Arabic-writing authors, cf. Bailey 1943, 179-180.

In the light of this evidence, and especially, bearing in mind the logical connection between hwyy/hw'p and Gayōmar's ejaculation that followed, I was led to ask myself: was there some additional, sexual, shade of meaning shared by both? "Sleep" and "sweat" have one thing in common, besides their phonetic similarity, namely: both would be easily imagined as euphemisms for sexual intercourse¹⁶. Had the Zandist(s) something like that in mind?

¹⁶ In many languages "to sleep" serves also in the sense of "to copulate", though, as far as I know, this is not the case in Pahlavi or Classical Persian [Bacher 1900 (p. 3 of the Hebrew part) published excerpts from a 14th century Hebrew dictionary from Eastern Iran, in which the Hebrew verb יָדַע (YDʿ, "to know" in the Biblical sense) was rendered in Judæo-Persian as 𐭪𐭥𐭥𐭥 (kwptn, xuftan). As to "sweat", this secretion could be easily seen as a euphemism for another secretions occurring during the intercourse, cf. Bd 11, on "semen" as a fluid, beside "sweat".

Ariš and Hahmī

In Y 31.5b appears the word *ərəšiš*, seen by Bartholomae (AiW 356) as a *hapax legomenon* "*ərəšay*-, f. "Neid", mit Akk. der Person und Gen. der Sache verb", with the phrase *hīiaṭ mōi ... dātā vahīiō ... yehīiā mā ərəšiš* [aḥat] translated as "von dem besseren Los ..., worum man mich benedet". Bartholomae was led to this translation by the Pahlavi version, which introduces here the demon *Ariš* (on whom cf., e.g., Zaehner 1955, 26, 27, 31, 430) being merely a transcription of the Avestan word, and by the supposed closeness to the word for "envy", *araskā*; in both, Bartholomae followed West 1892, 246-7 n. 7, whom he quoted in AiW.

In taking this route, Bartholomae dissociated the word in question (indeed, he put it as if being a *hapax*) from *ərəšya*-, "recht handelnd, gerecht" (AiW 356), Y 40.4, rendered by the Pahlavi version as *rāst*, from *ərəšva*-, "recht handelnd, gerecht; wahr, sicher" (AiW 356), Y 28.6; 29.3; 44.9; 51.5,11, also rendered by the Pahlavi version as *rāst*, from *ərəš*-, "richtig, recht, wahr" (AiW 355), Y 30.3; 44.10, 1-19; 48.9; 49.6, also rendered by the Pahlavi version as *rāst*.

However, it seems very unlikely that even on formal grounds *ərəšiš* could be taken apart from *ərəšya*, *ərəšva*, *ərəš*. This was early felt by scholars, and Bartholomae's explanation of the word in question was put aside. Thus, Wilkins Smith 1929, 75, translated it as "reward" [*viduiē vohū managhā māncā dāidīāi yehīiā mā ərəšiš*, "for knowing through good purpose, and for keeping in mind - (that) from which reward (shall come) to me"], clearly, from the same root as *ərəšya*, *ərəšva*, *ərəš*; Insler 1975, 37, translated "seer", and was followed by Humbach [Humbach 1991, I, 127; II, 63: "seer"; Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 35: "prophet"], having based on Indic *fṛṣi* -.

The clue to the whole of Y 31.5 [APPENDIX III TEXT I] lies, in my opinion, in the word *ašā*: this word, generally translated as "by truth" or "through truth" (only Wilkins Smith translated slightly differently: "for my justice"), refers, in my opinion, to the *real thing(s)* which can be revealed and propagated to the mankind, the "realm of righteous bliss" where these of the better (lot) (*vahīiō*) dwell immortal. This can be seen from the continuation of the Yasna, Y 31.6c: *hauruatātō ašāhiā amərətātasca*, "wholeness and immortality of *ašā*-(*"bliss"*)).

To achieve this, one has to know to "discern" (vTcidiiāi) between the good and the evil. The Pahlavi version [TEXT II] rightly introduced two glosses with mizd, "reward" (in after-life), into the line where aša is found.

As I have already noted, I do not dissociate the root of arəšīš from the similarly sounding words whose basic meaning is "right", etc.; there is no doubt, to my opinion, that the roots of arəšīš and aša were felt as identical, at least by the Prophet himself¹. In my analysis, he used two related words, while the second (arəšīš) serves to specify the meaning of the first (aša): it is the blissful existence of the righteous ones, not merely "truth". The connection between both crucial words was clear to the Zandist(s), as the notion is reflected in the remnants of the commentary to PY 30, surviving in Dk 9.31 [TEXT III]²: the Zandist(s) used the words "the most deceitful of dēws" (Dk 9.31.7-10) as the epithet of Ariš, not "the most envious one"; the promise Ariš, "the most deceitful of dēws", makes is the promise of immortality (Dk 9.31.8-9), i.e., of aša. He cannot deliver, of course (Dk 9.31.10), and this is the point of this nice *midrash*: he, so to speak, "liar called 'Truth'" cannot make people immortal, because in order to become immortal, i.e., to enter into the better (lot) = the "Best Existence", Zoroastrian paradise, one has to discern and remember that *real*, pre-existent truth as revealed by the Lord Wisdom (cf. also Dk 9.30.2) [TEXT V].

Our point of departure was rejection of the reliance by West and Bartholomae on the Pahlavi tradition in explaining a highly difficult Avestan passage. After them, much ink was spilt to convince the reader that the demon Ariš was conceived in the sin of ignorance of the Avestan language by the Zandist(s), or by some controversy between the "orthodox" and "heterodox" (cf., e.g., Zaehner 1955, 80, 148).

My analysis shows, I believe, that on the contrary, the Pahlavi version grasped the sense of the passage well enough, and introduced here, with much good humor, a literary convention which was not strange to the epoch and the region. So, e.g., in Genesis 24.1, God blessed Abraham bak-kōl, "in all", or with all"; there is a Jewish *midrash* (cf., e.g., TB Baba Bathra 16b; Sepher ha-BāhTr, cf. Kaplan 1995, 28) on this verse which makes [bak-]kōl the name of a daughter of Abraham, because a daughter is everything.

¹ There are, of course, other views on the root[s] of arəšīš and aša as well.

² Remnants of other commentaries of the same Yasna, partly preserved in Dk 9.7; 9.53, have no material which could be relevant for us here.

I think what happened in our Pahlavi commentary was comparable: the Sasanian reader was not expected to believe that there exists, indeed, a demon Ariš, exactly as the Jewish reader was not supposed to think that Abraham, amongst his many children, had a daughter named [bak-]kōl; no, the reader realized that this *midrashic* tour de force, in both cases, serves a didactic purpose, strengthening, in the case of the Sasanian reader, the traditional Zoroastrian value of the right choice. So, we came back to what we rejected in the beginning: the Zandist(s) knew their job; as in many other examples, not only in this, indeed, illustrious case, we find out by closer reading that Pahlavi versions of Avestan texts reflect a better understanding of the original than was earlier supposed.

Though it is not Y 30 proper that concerns us here³, nevertheless, it seems to me important to note here that the end of our Yasna (Y 30.3c) contains words that "invite" an eschatological exegesis: yā nōi vā aghaī aghaitī vā, "these which are not to be, or are to be". But it was understood by the Zandist(s) as referring rather to after-life and personal, not collective, eschatology. In another part of the Pahlavi version of the same Yasna (PY 31.14 [TEXT IV]), the possible eschatological implications were played down, too.

The passage has certain eschatological overtones in Avestan [yā zt āitī jānghatīca, "the things that are approaching and will reach (us)", tr. Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 37], but the Zandist, though correctly grasping *a*, transformed the whole of the passage into a legalistic problem about the debt obligations to righteous and wicked people. It was achieved through using of "standard" Pahlavi equivalents of Avestan words: ābām for išud- and hangirdīgīh for hōrkərat-.

The possible eschatological dimensions of Avestan hōrkərat- were, thus, played down by the more prosaic Pahlavi hangirdīgīh. In its existing Pahlavi form, this passage could hardly be used in any secondary apocalyptic literature; however, it is plausible to suggest that the word ābām (standing frequently, as here, for Avestan išud-), pronounced (New Persian wām) similarly to āwām, "period of time, era", could have been inspired some apocalyptic commentary. It is not without interest, for characterization of the notions current among the redactors of the "authorized" PY version, that they did not choose this option.

At this point, we leave our imaginary demon Ariš, only in order to return to him later.

³ After much consideration and many doubts, I decided to exclude almost completely the material pertinent to Y 28-32 from my work, for such material, dealing with various aspects of these Gāθās and their Pahlavi versions and ramifications of such versions, is too vast.

Some Western Iranians evidently held the belief that Ohrmazd was unable to create the light, and it was the demon Mahmī who had learned the secret from Ahriman and taught Ohrmazd how to beget the sun and moon by the intercourse with his mother and sister (cf. Kreyenbroek 1993, 304b). This can be seen from the Manichaean Mahmī fragment⁴, which supposedly represents a Zoroastrian, though "unorthodox", tradition; another source is known from the Armenian polemicist Eznik⁵.

The Manichaean text in question actually states that Ohrmazd is slandered by the saying that kūš Māhmī dēw hammoxt šahr rōšn kirdan, "that he was taught by the demon Māhmī to make the world light". The name of the demon was explained in Nyberg 1938, 385, as "mediator", similarly to the Greek appellation of Mithra, μεσότης (on which cf. Shaked 1980); this view was rejected in Henning 1951, 51 n. 1, cf. also Zaehner 1955, 63, 150 and n. 1. However, the demon Mahmī works indeed as a mediator between Ohrmazd and Ahriman in some of the anti-Zoroastrian passages assembled by Zaehner.

However, Schaefer 1941, derived the name of the demon from a mistranslation (similarly to the way the demon Arīš was conceived, Y 30.3c, cf. Zaehner 1955, 149) of the words daēuuā mahmī mānōi in Y 32.1, where we now read in the extant Pahlavi version dēwān pad mān menīšnTh, "dēws by my thought". In the Gāthic passage (Y 32.1), the demons want to be Ohrmazd's messengers; a certain demon sought to come to an understanding with Ohrmazd, the idea being not unfamiliar to Dk 9.32 (cf. below, "Mani and Zand"). (Two points should be noted here: 1), the word daēuuā in Y 32.1 can mean not "demons", but just "gods"; 2), daēuuā could be taken not only as a Vocative, but as a Nominative, as well (cf., e.g., Wilkins Smith 1929, 83), and in this case, it agrees with other subjects (xVāētūš, vāerazōnām). Nevertheless, the extant Zand of the Gāthic passage seems to have not much in common with the Dēnkard version.

4 M 28; partly published in Möller 1904, 94; Salemann 1908, 10; the relevant passage in Henning 1951, 50; Zaehner 1955, 431 F 3(b), 439 F 7(b); now the text is fully published in Skjærvø 1996b, 244-7.

5 If.8, ed. Venice, 1926, 153, cf. also Zaehner 1955, 63, 147ff., 438 F 7(a): zayn lōwāl Mahmeay divi va-vā-i ar. Ormizd hasanēr, ew zxorhōurdh nma i ver hanēr, "having heard that, the div Mahmī arrived before Ormizd with all speed and betrayed to him this plan". Eznik mentioned also the demons Kundi, Kuntī (which is also known from Manichaean texts, as summarized in the Zoroastrian polemical composition SGW and from Bar Koniay, cf. Benveniste 1932-33, 203) and Gwmp, Gunmarf,

*gandarawa, according to Henning 1951, 51 n. 3, pace Benveniste 1932-33, 201 & de Menasce 1949, 4ff.). A similar story was told by Theodore Abū Qurra (cf. Zaehner 1955, 428 F 2) and referred to in the Syriac Acts of Adur-Hormizd (cf. Zaehner 1955, 148, 435-6 F 5), who, however, did not mention the name of Mahmī.

The views of Nyberg and Schaefer about the origin and meaning of Mahmī's name were reconciled by Russell 1987b, who rejected Schaefer's etymological objections, while adopting his ingenious guess about daēuuā mahmī mānōi in Y 32.1, and accepting Nyberg's etymology and translation. According to Russell, the demon Mahmī was known in Arsacid/Sasanian Iran, and his name originally meant "mediator". It seems that Russell opted for a non-scriptural provenance of Mahmī. An Avestan background was looked by the Zandists(s) for Mahmī and found indeed in the word of Y 32.1. If so, one would suggest that the story told in the Dēnkard version (Dk 9.32) could be an "Avestization" of a non-Avestan import, probably from Western (or, Manichaean?) sources.

Mahmī still survives in the living Parsee tradition, invoked in an Avestan nērang-prayer called nērang-e hājāt o maqšūd xVāstan, "spell of asking a wish for something sought" (cf. Russell 1987b, 77-8). No wonder, the spell quotes, as one would expect, from Y 32.1! This implies two things: 1., Mahmī derives, indeed, as was postulated by scholars, from Y 32.1; 2., anti-Zoroastrian sources that mentioned Mahmī described something that really has been existing in Zoroastrian (popular?) practice, so, we should conclude that Y 32.1 was once interpreted in such a sense as these sources (according to Schaefer) suggest⁶.

Moreover, the same Manichaean text scours those who assert that Ohrmizd and Ahrimēn are brothers, 'wd gwynd kw 'whrmzyd 'wd 'hrmyn br'dr hynd.

Here we leave Mahmī and return to Arīš. Besides PY 31.5 and Dk 9.31.6-11 derived from it, Arīš appears in Dk 9.30.4-5, a chapter which is supposed to be a remnant of the commentary to Y 30. In the extant Pahlavi version of Y 31 there is no Arīš, but there are two connected (and identical) passages, namely Y 30.3c, 6a, which are paraphrased in Dk 9.30.4-5, and in which the words arāš vīšlīātā, "they discriminate rightly", are found, being natural candidates to look for Arīš. However, Arīš is absent from the Pahlavi versions of both Y 30.3c and Y 30.6a.

6 And, probably, we should give more credit to the anti-Zoroastrian sources in general.

The Pahlavi version of Y 30.3c renders Avestan āscā hūdāhō arəš višīātā nōit duždāhō as kē awēšān awē ī hudānāg [Ohrmazd] rāst be wiziđ nē hān duš.dānāg [Gannāg Mēnōg], "the one of them who has good knowledge [Ohrmazd] chose the right, not the one who has bad knowledge [the Stinking Spirit]"; the Pahlavi version of Y 30.6a (almost) rightly renders Avestan aiā nōit arəš višīātā daēuuācinā hīai īš ā dabaomā as awēšān nē rāst bē wizenēnd kē dēwān hēnd cegāmaz ēw, "those do not choose rightly, even a little, who are dēws".

Compare the quotation in Dk 9.30.8: ud ēnāz kū nē.šān rāst bē wiziđan duš.gannāg dēw nē hāgīrz rāst bē wizenēnd kē kāmāg hān ī Akōman, "and this, too, that they cannot choose rightly, badly stinking dēws, they never choose rightly, whose will is that of Akōman", in which both PY 30.3c and 6.a are combined (with slight variation owing to the bad manuscript tradition): rāst bē wiziđan duš.gannāg / rāst bē wiziđ ... duš.dānāg [Gannāg Mēnōg] and rāst bē wizenēnd / rāst bē wizenēnd.

I believe that the context and the syntax of the Avestan passages are such that they could not allow the demon Ariš to be introduced into their Pahlavi versions, even as an import from PY 31.5. Nevertheless, Ariš is found in the Dk paraphrase of them, but before turning to Dk 9.30.4-5, it should be recalled that Y 30.3 is not just another Avestan passage, as interesting as it is: it is the "Twin Passage", probably, the most "sacramental" passage in the whole Avesta.

What is ascribed to the demon Ariš in the commentary to PY 30? It is exactly what is ascribed to the demon Mahmī by the Manichaean Abursām and by the Armenian Eznik: "Ohrmazd and Ahriman were two brothers in one womb (Ohrmazd ud Ahriman dō brād ī pad ēwag aškom[b] būd hēnd). Of them an Amahraspand chose the worse inasmuch as his adherents preach the worship of demons and that they should offer cattle (as sacrifice) to the demons of the planets". And on the deceit of the demon Ariš, and (on) the separate origin of the light and darkness".

Now compare the wording of M 28 as quoted in Henning 1951, 50:

ʔwd gwynd kw ʔwhrmzyd ʔwd ʔhrmyn brʔdr hynd, "and they say that Ohrmizd and Ahrmēn are brothers".

Compare also the Manichaean Uigur x^Vānstwānīft (Asmussen 1965, 169, 194): Xormuzta tāgrīli Sīmnulī cīčīli ol, "Xormuzta tāgrī and Sīmnulī tāgrī are brothers (actually: younger

and elder brother)"⁷.

This is to be observed that the addition "in one womb" in Ok 9.30.4 is very important, for it finds its parallel in Eznik's version of the "Zurvanite myth": Ormizd ew Arhmn y-acan yarqandi mair lwreanc, "Ormizd and Arhmn strive in the womb of their mother".

Thus, where the Avestan text has arəš, the Pahlavi commentary has Ariš, and Dk 9.30.4-5 called Ariš the one whom the non-Zoroastrian sources named Mahmī. It is not easy to explain this fusion. We cannot state that a supposed Mahmī passage was censored (and eliminated completely from the texts, first of all, from PY 32.1c) and Ariš was introduced instead from PY 31.5 (where Ariš first occurred) into a lost Pahlavi version of Y 30.3,6 and henceforth, via a lost commentary on Y 30, into Dk 9.30.4-5; this is impossible because the quote put into the mouth(s) of Ariš/Mahmī in Dk 9.30.4 and in the Manichaean manuscript 28 is based, indeed, on Y 30.3, where arəš is found.

I have only one solution, though its plausibility can be easily questioned: Dk 9.30.4 and M 28 have so much in common that one could certainly suggest that M 28 reflects the commentary on Y 30.3, most probably, the same text that is still extant as Dk 9.30.4ff. At the same time, Dk 9.30.4ff., though a paraphrase of Y 30.3, differs considerably from the text it is supposed to comment upon. Let us compare again Dk 9.30.4ff. and the Pahlavi version of the "Twin Passage". Y 30.3:

at tā mainiū pouruiē yā yāmā x^Vafənā asruuātām,

"These are the two spirits (existing) in the beginning, twins who have been heard of as the two dreams" (tr. Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 31).

PY 30.3a:

ēdōn hān ī har dō mēnōg [Ohrmazd ud Gannāg] ašān fradom hān ī jumāy x^Vad srūd [kū.šān wināh ud kirbag x^Vad bē guft],

"thus these both spirits [Ohrmazd and Gannāg], they praised themselves together in the beginning [*i.e.*, they pronounced their sin and their virtue]".

⁷ Cf. also von le Coq 1911, 282; Bang 1923, 147; Zaehner 1955, 432: "Khormuzta (der Urmensch) und Schimnu (der Urteufel) sind jüngerer und älterer Brüder".

The crucial *hapax* *yāmā*, undoubtedly "twins", was rendered by the *Zandist*(s) as (etymologically related) *jumāy*, Old Pahlavi **yumāy*, "together" (glossed over "sin and virtue", cf. Blochet 1898, 28), thus having evaded the peril of making *Ōhrmazd* and the Stinking Spirit brothers. As Schaefer 1930, 82 n.2, rightly noted, it is simply a transcription, with a *Lesezeichen* (the Sanskrit version made from the Pahlavi rendered here *bhūmaṇḍale*, "on the earth-circle", being a misreading: *jwm'y > *zamīg*).

Avestan *x^vafənā*, though generally rightly understood as *x^vāb*, "sleep, dream" (AiW 1863) [cf. above, "Sleep and Sweat"], was rendered here, and only here, as *x^vad*, "himself" (some partial reason for which was, perhaps, the phonetic similarity of the Avestan word to Middle Western-Iranian dialectal forms close to Parthian *wxyby* [*wxēbēh*], "own"; *x^vafənā* thus could be understood as "selfhood", and both twins seem to have chosen their "selfhood" deliberately (compare Zaehner 1955, 120). (In passing, it seems to me not without importance that the word *x^vaētus*, related to *x^vad*, is found in the passage that was presumably the source of Mahmt speculation, namely, Y 32.1; on the link between *x^vaētus* and Mahmt, cf. Zaehner 1955, 150).

The fact that two words in a row were wrongly interpreted, while one of them was rendered so only here, requires explanation and one might suspect that the wrong interpretation was intentional. My solution is that the difference between PY 30.3 and Dk 9.30.4 is the difference between two mode of exegesis: while Dk 9.30.4 rightly translated Y 30.3 as "Ōhrmazd ud Ahriman dō brād ī pad ēwag aškom(b) būd hēnd", "Ōhrmazd and Ahriman were two brothers in one womb", it itself ascribed it to the *dēw Ariš*, "who daevically chattered (*drāyistan*) that" etc., making from the line a quotation of an idiotic statement of the "liar named 'Truth'", naturally to be frowned upon.

At the same time, PY 30.3 having been supposed to represent the shorter and the matter-of-fact version, read by ordinary fellows unskilled in Avestan, rendered the Gāthic text in a form of a resumé: it just had no place to explain at length why Ōhrmazd and Ahriman were not two twins and what exactly this *x^vafənā* was. In other words, the *Zandist*(s) of PY 30.3 was/were limited by the lack of place and thus forced to translate in an "incorrect" way.

To return for a moment to Dk 9.30.4, it is interesting that Ahriman is called "an Amahraspand", thus making him look like a Lucifer, a fallen angel, rather than a principle absolutely opposed to Ōhrmazd, thus perhaps indicating that he was perceived by the commentator(s) to be a twin to Ōhrmazd.

There is, probably, an indication in the following of PY 30.3 itself, namely in PY 30.4, that the Pahlavi versions of the Gāthās were perceived to contain abbreviated and triggering *aggadic* associations. Thus, PY 30.4ab presupposes some knowledge of *Zands* like that found in Bd 1a.13(b) (cf. [TEXT I] in the APPENDIX I to "Sleep and Sweat").

PY 30.4ab:

(a. *a[īcā] hīat[ī] tā hām mainiūd jasaētampouruuīm dazdē*
b. *gaēmca[ī] ajīāitīmca hīatcā aghat[ī] apām m aghuš[ī]*)

a. *ēdōnāz hān ī har dō mēnōg ō ham mad hēnd ō hān ī awē ī fradom dahišn* [kū
har dō mēnōg ō Gayōmard mad hēnd]

b. *kēz pad zīwandagīh* [Ōhrmazd pad ēd kār kū wēš zīwandag dārānd] *ud kēz*
pad a.zīwandagīh [Gānnāg Mēnōg pad ēd kār kū wēš bē ōzanānd] *kēz ēdōn*
hān hast tā ō hān ī abdom andar axvān [kū mardomaz ī abārīg abar dh
rasēd].

a. "Thus, too, these two "spirits" come together to this first creation [*i.e.*, these two come to Gayōmard]

b. one, too, (came) with life [Ōhrmazd (came) with this effect that they could preserve more life], one, too, (came) with non-life [the Stinking Spirit (came) with this effect that they could kill more], who, too, is thus this until the last one among the existences [*i.e.*, it will happen so also to other men].

Gayōmard of the gloss to PY 30.4a stands for Avestan paourvīm dazdē, understood by the Zandist as "first creation" (dahīšn, one of whose meanings is "creation", regularly stands for infinitive dazdiš; here dazdē is a finite verb). "Creation" must be understood here in the sense of "creature" (cf. Shaked 1994a, 54 n.15, who observed that "the two spirits came to Gayōmard presumably as a creature, not as a deity"). An error in analyzing the Avestan grammar provoked the *midrashic* reference to the myth which was supposed to be widely known, cf. Bd 1a.13(b). Another factor responsible for inserting here Gayōmard was, I believe, the phonetic similarity to gaēm (formed from the same root), which stands in the next line (rendered as [pad] zīwandagīh; [pad] a.zīwandagīh stands for ajiiaēitīma, two Accusatives understood as *Instrumental).

In conclusion, some remarks should be made about Dk 9.30 [TEXT V], which summarizes a lost text of a late provenance composed in circles which could be defined as ritualistically minded and open to mystical speculations. These circles were loyal to the throne and eager to stress the well-known Sasanian "twinship" of the Religion and the State, but, at the same time, some ideas which I call here, only for convenience, "Manichaean" managed to find their way into their mode of thinking⁸. Being a Warštmanšār sort of commentary on the Gāōš Aētā.vaxšīiā (Y 30), this text treats liturgical effects reached by a proper performance of the ritual by a properly-minded and knowledgeable priest (§1); the text included "advices" (andarz) incorporated into the *midrashic* text, to look for a peaceful place where one can devote himself to religious studies (§3) as long as he can, to keep one's mind always to think that which is righteous, as "his sagacity increases" therefrom (§15), to seek the true religion, to abstain from sinning towards creations, to strive for the benefit of people (§16), as these is the means to bring about the Renovation and the prosperity of creations.

At the same time, the text saw both the Avesta[n Religion] and the [Iranian] royalty as a means to forward the salvation of the creatures, while the mission of the Religion and the royalty is to cause wounds and harm to the dēws and to restore rulership to Ōhrmazd (§10), as it was prior to the Mixture (gumēzišn). Defeating some hostile ("lying", drōzan) army (a possible

reference to Bahrām ī Cōbēn's revolt and the mutinies thereafter?) was seen as such a tremendously important event, that the defeaters are said to "put on the shining light" (§14); the members of all four "classes" of the Sasanian society are praised (supposedly, for their support of the ruling family) for making well to themselves, having good and peaceful mind (supporting the King?), etc. (§14). Though the extant summary of the Pahlavi commentary on the Yasna in question stresses (Dk 9.30.2,8) the importance of the human choice to discriminate between the evil and the good, nevertheless, Ōhrmazd's rulership needs here special attention: it is not self-evident, one makes Ōhrmazd (and the Avesta[n Religion]) the lord of the world when he accepts him as such (§14), because choosing Ōhrmazd's rulership and Avestan wisdom, Dēn dānāgīh (§10), one enables Ōhrmazd to become again, abāz, the lord of the world. Though basically this scheme possesses all the classical features of Zoroastrianism, nevertheless, one could hardly help feeling here some "Manichaean" or rather "Gnostic" flavor: Ōhrmazd here is too reminiscent of a savior captured and awaiting to be redeemed, as in many Gnostic systems.

In Dk 9.30.12 we have a version of PY quoted in the summary of the Nask, while the (containing glosses) version quoted differs from the extant PY. One could easily see from the quotations from the PY 30 given in my notes to [TEXT V] how closely the commentary surviving in Dk 9.30 followed the Pahlavi Yasna, building on it, at the same time, a different text.

While Artš/Mahmī originated in PY 31.5 represents a strange tradition of *midrashic-aggadic* character, it is necessary to take it not only in the isolated context of the verse (or, line) wherein it appears, but also in the fuller context of the Pahlavi version of the Yasna in question and the remnants of its commentary. It could be an illuminating (and, at the same time, probably, frustrating) exercise: one reveals that the texts deal with the merits of studying the Avesta and its Zand properly and with oppression of the heretics with arms. In most cases, the Pahlavi version of the Yasna is relatively close to the Avestan original (cf., e.g., Y 31.18-19 [TEXT VI]); were we not in possession of both Avestan original and its Pahlavi translation of Y 31.18-19, but only the paraphrase given in Dk 9.31.22-24 [TEXT VII], we could be easily led to the (wrong) conclusion that what we have in Dk 9.31.22-24 is, actually, a sequence of anti-heretical diatribes of the period of, say, the fierce reaction to the views of Mani, Mazdak and other heretics. This is, of course, not the case, and it is why such an exercise could be frustrating: the task of dating Zoroastrian Pahlavi texts is extremely difficult.

⁸ There could be other possible explanations of this striking resemblance of some passages of Dk 9.30 and Manichaean texts, except the assumption that some clandestine Manichaeans were there at work, or the *Zeitgeist* was responsible for some secondary recurrent developments, etc. One would say that this particular text, together with some other Warštmanšār texts, are, on the contrary, old and represent some sort of (Zoroastrian) religious meditation which Mani himself could have been able to learn about.

Mānī and Zand

In the following pages I will try to demonstrate that the evidence preserved by the extant Pahlavi tradition of the *Zands* might go, in several cases, as far back as the beginning of the 3rd century CE, for I find correspondences between Mānī's *Sāhbuhragān* and some passages found in *Bundahišn* and *Dēnkard* 9, thus Mānī's *Sāhbuhragān* should be taken as preserving older *Zand* material¹, but first we have to turn to a brief review of some problems connected with Mānī's only Iranian composition.

There can be no doubt that a substantial Manichaean literature in Syriac/Aramaic² was flourishing, as Mānī himself wrote mostly in this language. It would contain not only the originals of Mānī's works now extant only in translations or partly/entirely lost, but also perhaps translations from other tongues, like Western Middle Iranian and Greek (and, possibly, Coptic, as there exist fragments of a Manichaean Syriac-Coptic dictionary³).

Aramaic seems to be the original language of the Manichaean liturgy, thus some remnants of Aramaic (and Hebrew) formulas (cf. Schaeder 1930, 84 n.1) were preserved in texts in Parthian, and even in Chinese transliterations of Aramaic (cf. Yoshida 1983). There are some indications that secondary usage of Aramaic/Syriac had some place among Manichaean communities in the Iranian World in later epochs (cf. Sundermann 1993a, 164)⁴. The same phenomenon is known in the West, as concerning some Hebrew and Greek cultic formulas in the Latin Catholic liturgy (and remnants of Hebrew formulas in the Greek Orthodox and Roman

¹ On the possibility of Parthian *Zands*, cf. Sundermann 1979a, 784-5; Boyce 1985b, 473a.

² If not noted otherwise, the terms *Aramaic* and *Syriac* are used in this discussion indiscriminately.

³ On Syriac Manichaica from Egypt, cf. Lieu 1994, 62-4, with bibliography. It is believed that Mānī's Aramaic fragments are preserved in Syriac (Christian anti-Manichaean) writings, cf. Schaeder 1926, Baumstark 1931. Of course, Aramaic, Iranian, Greek should count as possible candidates for the source-languages of the Coptic Manichaica (though some secondary reverse developments are also possible); one of the most intriguing examples of Aramaic impact on the language of the Coptic Manichaica is *ⲗⲓⲁⲓⲙⲉ* used in *Kephalaia* (e.g., *Keph* 49), which was seen as a word of a possibly Semitic origin, being a derivative of Aramaic *lhm*, thus **lhmē*: "links, connections" (cf. Syriac *lāhēm* *lāhēm*, "conjunctio"), as *ⲗⲓⲁⲓⲙⲉ* signifies non-material threads pulled from the heaven to the earth (cf. Chapter III.1 Appendix II *Sadwēs*). A similar notion is known also in the Mandaean tradition, where it is called (by the originally non-Mandaean term) *qitṛa*.

⁴ Sogdian *pr* *l'ygy'nyy* *w'w'k*, "in the Tajiki tune", Parthian *swryg* *nw'g*, "Syriac tune", i.e., Aramaic, cf. Sundermann 1993a, 163. The Syriac inscription Mānī *šālīhā dāyīšōc* *māšīhā*, "Mānī the Apostle of Jesus Christ", on Mānī's *Bēma* presented on a gem (cf. de Menasce & Guillou 1946) may have been peculiar to Syriac-speaking Manichaeans, but probably was in use also far eastward.

Catholic liturgies). With the disappearance of the Aramaic-speaking Manichaean communities, Aramaic Manichaean texts, including most of Mānī's original works, fell into disuse.

Unlike Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Islam, but rather like Buddhism, Mandaism and Christianity, Manichaeism had no "language of truth" uniquely containing the divine word. However, Mānī, who grew in a Judaeo-Christian sect as a speaker of Aramaic, was never referred to as a non-Iranian in Zoroastrian sources; his religion was never dubbed as some sort of Christianity which in its turn derives from Judaism, as is the case, though much later, with Islam in *Skand Gumānīg Wizār* (*SGW*⁵). On the contrary, Mānī was called an Iranian *zandīg*, not an inventor of a non-Iranian religion. It is true, Manichaeism was easily disguised as some sort of Christianity, as in the Greco-Roman West, or of Buddhism, as in China, but, I think, the case of Manichaean mimicry in the Zoroastrian world was different.

Neither a Hellenist, like his Babylonian *Landsmann* Tatian, who went West and wrote in Greek, nor entirely Iranian by culture and language, Mānī chose to trade a religion for the New Imperial *Erānšāhr* on the tide of her global expansion. We shall never know for certain whether *Sāhpuhr*, to whom Mānī presented his only Persian work, named "the book written for King *Sāhpuhr*", *Sāhbuhragān*⁶, realized that the religion Mānī was trying to sell to him was actually a form of (Gnostic) Christianity, or the King of Kings comprehended the possible political implications of a new syncretic religion for a new multi-cultural empire; or, probably, the King imagined that "the doctor from Babylon", born near the newly-established Sasanian capital, and presumably a scion to the overturned Arsacid dynasty⁷, speaking poor Persian (cf. Boyce 1983b, 1196)⁸, was one of those *mōbads* who knew how to recite the *Zand*, an explanation of the Sacred Avesta?

However, though we do know that Mānī used some *Zand* traditions (Sundermann 1978), we do not know whether he was able to read Pahlavi or recite Avestan (cmp. Sundermann 1979a, 783-4). The last one probably not, as it was a priestly business, and the school training of

⁵ Edited in de Menasce 1945. On this aspect, cf. Shaked 1990a.

⁶ I prefer this transliteration rather than the one used in the title of the edition by MacKenzie 1979-80, for reasons of standardization and convenience.

⁷ However, many scholars took Mānī's Arsacid descent as a later legend.

⁸ On the rôle of the Aramaean *Nūh zādāg* and Mānī's ability to speak Middle Persian and/or Parthian, cf. Widengren 1983a, 971, and n. 6.

Zoroastrian priests was perhaps not yet developed as fully as in the Late Sasanian period⁹.

Mānī himself had only an Aramaic name (though one which could be interpreted as Iranian, and this was made, indeed, by the author of Dk 3.200), and no trace of his Iranian name, Kīrbagīg, was preserved in sources Iranian or Manichaean proper¹⁰. He was called even in Iranian with an Aramaic title, Mār ("Lord") Mānī. The names of his partisans were mostly Aramaic, in any case, not distinctly Zoroastrian. We know almost nothing about the cultural affiliations of people first converted into Mānī's religion (outside his own family, though some information we possess about it is indecisive). We do not know, e.g., whether there were among them Zoroastrian priests who could transmit Zoroastrian lore into the new faith. The use of a form of the Syriac alphabet may not indicate that the target group for conversion was exclusively the Syriac/Aramaic-speaking communities: the so-called "Manichaean alphabet" could serve an Iranian language not worse, even better, than e.g., the Arabic script did later¹¹.

The first point made by Mānī concerning the question in what ways his religion is better than the previous ones is purely political: many languages, one religion. The third point is that all the souls that did not achieve perfection¹² through the former religions can reach it through that of Mānī. It implies that all the souls can be saved, even those of our ancestors¹³.

The idea of "many languages - one religion" derives ultimately from Mānī's Judæo-Christian background. We do not know whether Jewish and/or Christian scriptures existed in any form in Iranian vernaculars about Mānī's time; it is only at least a century after that we hear about such versions.

9 M 5794=T II D 126, cf. Henning 1933b, 295-6; Boyce 1975a, 29, seems to stress the point of superiority of Mānī's writings upon those of the earlier religions. The text has a lacuna in the crucial place and, in its extant form, affords plenty of speculations. Among those: did Mānī intend to say that the earlier writings, including those of the Zoroastrians, were distorted? Does it imply he saw them? Was it stated by him that the "Magian" script was too difficult? Or, did he mean that the Zoroastrians possess no writings at all?

10 On Mānī's name, cf. now Shapira 1999; to the bibliography of the topic given there add Klīma 1962, 260-270.

11 Compare Tardieu 1982, 44.

12 pad xwys dyn qyrdg'n ny hnzt, "(Jene frühere Seelen, die in ihrer Religion die Werke nicht vollbracht haben", cf. Henning 1933b, 296; "(by whose souls) in their own religion good action was not completed", Boyce 1975a, 30 n.3; hnzt means "to be fulfilled, perfect", a clear calque of the Semitic nīšlām / īštallām. In latter Middle Persian Manichaean texts, Syriac *šlāmā corresponds to ispurrgārīh; compare Shapira 1999.

13 I deliberately avoid here to deal with those elements of Mānī's doctrine which had Buddhist origin.

At the close of the fourth century, John Chrysostomus declared that the doctrines of Christ had been translated into the languages of the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, and the Ethiopians - but he added "and ten thousands other nations", weakened his own evidence in regard to the Persian or any one version in particular¹⁴; the Syrian bishop Theodoretus in the fifth century mentions a "Persian" version of the Scriptures, and the extant quotations in SGW from Biblical [Old and New Testament] sources may be derived from this or a similar text [cf. APPENDIX I "Biblical Quotes"]; inasmuch as during the second half of the fifth century an eminent teacher, Ma'nā of Sīrāz, made translations of the works of Diodorus, Theodorus of Mopsuestia and other ecclesiastical writers, from Syriac into his native Persian dialect, we may be confident that Christian Scriptures had already been translated (Metzger 1977, 276) in the fifth century. As to the situation about Mānī's times, it remains unknown. However, our sources for evaluating latter Middle Western Iranian Bible translations are: the Turfan Psalms, quotations from the Law Book, SGW quotations¹⁵, and finally, Mānī's own works. On the Jewish side, at least the Scroll of Esther was known in some Jewish Iranian vernacular (TB Megillah 18a).

There existed a rich Christian literature in Sogdian, mostly translated from Syriac, but almost nothing has survived from the Christian literature in Middle Persian in Iran proper. The reason may be the fact that the Christianization and Judaization of Iranian populations in Sasanian Iran were accompanied by a partial linguistical-cultural Semitization, when a Semitic tongue (Syriac for Christians, Aramaic and Hebrew for Jews) became adopted as the language of religious training and writing¹⁶.

When the Zoroastrian Mardān Farraxv son of Ohrmazd-dād wrote in the ninth century for his son his apologetic work, SGW, refuting the other religions, he included into his work long quotations from extant Middle Persian translations of the Jewish and Christian Scripture; bearing in mind that a Pahlavi translation (from Syriac) of the Psalms 94-99, 118, 121-136, found in Turfan (cf. Andreas & Barr, 1933), used a local (or communal?) derivation of the ideographic Book Pahlavi script, it must have been understood by the Magian scribes without much labor. This fact implies that if all or most Christian Middle Persian writings were recorded, like the Turfan Psalter, in the ideographic Book Pahlavi script, then Zoroastrians and Persian Christians would be able to read the writings of the other denomination.

14 But, cf. a Christian fragment in "Median" in Armenian characters published in Bailey 1943a, which may go back to the Middle Iranian epoch.

15 Several Biblical (OT & NT) quotations are to be found on seals: "Lord's Prayer" and Ps 146(7), cf. Gignoux & Gyselen 1982, 33; Gignoux 1980, 312, Shaked 1996b, 248; Lam. 3.55, Ps 28.7, or 89.14, Shaked 1996b, 252; Ps 58.12, Shaked 1996b, 252; cf. also *ib.*, 249.

16 This phenomenon is well attested for different Judaized groups.

It is a strange fact; Zoroastrians and Christians shared the same script, while the people who pretended to understand the inner truth of the *Zand*s, namely the Persian (and some other Iranian-speaking) Manichaeans, used not the script in which the *Zand*s were recorded, but another one, used for the Syriac language (which is, of course, more convenient for recording Iranian speech than the ideographical Book Pahlavi¹⁷); so far, no Manichaean texts in Book Pahlavi were found.

However, while the Pahlavi Psalms from Turfan (Bulayiq) are in Book Pahlavi, a Christian Psalms' fragment from the same place in New Persian is in Syriac script (cf. Müller 1915)¹⁸.

The identification of one's religion with a particular system of characters used for writing the same language in the later Near East (as is the case with Arabic written in Greek, Coptic, Syriac and Hebrew letters) by members of different communities may go back to Sassanian times¹⁹. Among Jews, only very few linguistic communities used to record their vernaculars in *non-Hebrew* characters, mostly, those whose languages could only with difficulty be recorded in a consonantal script²⁰. As a rule, one may say that recording a vernacular in Hebrew characters is a specific Jewish trait; on this basis, it seems that the Jews had less recourse to the Middle Persian Bible versions than the Christians, but this impression may be wrong. As to Mānī's choice of a variation of the Syriac script to record Iranian speech, it was probably motivated by Mānī's universalist outlook (though we cannot know for certain whether the "Manichaean" script in which the manuscripts of Mānī's *Sāhbuhragān* exist now was the original script, or the text written down in, say, "Book Pahlavi" script was transcribed into the "Manichaean" script some time later.

17 His reason for introducing "Syriac" alphabet might be not only practical. Bīrūnī in *Āḡār al-Bāḡiyah*, Sachau 1879, 190, says that Mānī arranged his *Sāhbuhragān* according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, the alphabet being, invariably, the Aramaic, cf. also Reeves 1992, 33; unfortunately, this information could not be proved from the fragments published by MacKenzie. However, the parallels both to the 21 Nasks of the Avesta, arranged according to the 21 words of the most holy Zoroastrian prayer, and to Mazdak's the mystical usage of letters is striking.

18 There are more Persian pieces written in Syriac characters to be found in Nestorian texts, cf. de Menasce 1945, 178, also n. 3.

19 It is worth notice that the Scroll of Esther reflecting Arsacid realities speaks about "royal orders sent to each nation in its own language and writing" ("characters").

20 The most spectacular exception being the Hellenistic Jews; however, this example has very peculiar features that cannot be dealt with here. It is worth noting that Byzantine "Romaniot" Jews wrote their Greek in Hebrew characters.

Mānī's *Sāhbuhragān* is partly a pericope of Mt 24, 25:31-46 [M 475 and M 477, Müller 1904, 11-15]; Mk 13, 16.1, Lk 21, 24.1, as has been noted for a long time. Though it was stated that Mānī used for his book *Sāhbuhragān* some existing Middle Persian translation of the New Testament²¹ or parts of it (on Middle Persian Bible translations cf. Shaked 1990b) rather than making his own *ad hoc* translation into Middle Persian from the Syriac New Testament²², our evidence is insufficient to pass a judgment. Generally, the text was supposed to be Tatian's Diatessaron²³, but according to new researches, the situation was more complicated²⁴; however, later on Manichaeans made use of the four Canonical Gospels. In any case, an Aramaic *Vorlage* is traceable, for the author of the book was thinking in Aramaic²⁵. All of Mānī's works were composed by him in Aramaic, with the exception of the Middle Persian *Sāhbuhragān*, which is thus the only surviving literary work by Mānī (as most of the original Aramaic material was presumably lost²⁶). Bearing in mind this composition (*Sāhbuhragān*), Henning wrote: "Mani knew some Persian and even had composed one of his books in, it is true, somewhat halting Persian"²⁷. Going perhaps in Henning's footsteps, this single work written by Mānī in Iranian was seen as full of "mistakes", "because of Mani's scanty knowledge of this language"²⁸. Boyce 1983c, 1196, did not accept Mānī's authorship of the Middle Persian text of *Sāhbuhragān*: "whether Mani himself wrote the actual Middle Persian version [of *Sāhbuhragān*] is doubtful, for years later, after long sojourn at the Sasanian court, he still chose to be accompanied by an interpreter at an audience with Šāhpūr's son, Bahrām I... Probably, ..., as a young man he wrote the *Sāhbuhragān* in his mother-tongue, Aramaic, and had it translated into Middle

21 "He seems to have used especially the Syriac version of Tatian's Diatessaron", cf. Schneemelcher 1991, I, 401.

22 Passion and resurrection fragments M 132 and M 18 are parts of the Diatessaron, *ib.*; Parthian M 4570 is from Passion Diatessaron, cf. also Sundermann 1986, 82ff..

23 It is a remarkable (and still not explained) fact that the New Persian Diatessaron (ed. by Messina 1951), which is of great value, has survived.

24 Thus, according to Tardieu 1987, 144, the Manichaean Gospel is an abbreviated Harmony, based on Matthew as concerning Jesus' oral teachings and on Luke as concerning Passion events.

25 On Mānī's language, cf. Lidzbarski 1927; Rosenthal 1939, 207-211: "many Iranian Manichaean writings have an Aramaic substratum", *ibid.*, 207 nn. 5-6, "and even Coptic ones", *ib.*, n. 7; Henning's remarks to Tsui Chi 1943-46, 217: "...the *Qšudagān* [*qwdš] *āfriwān* had originally been written in the Syriac language...by Mani himself"; Haloun & Henning 1952-3, 205-6; Polotski 1933, 66ff.; Polotski 1935, 242.6-14, 243.35-46).

26 It was supposed, and, probably, with right, that the account of the Syriac bishop Bar-Konay is based on Mānī's original writings.

27 Henning 1940-42, 953.

28 Khanian 1347[h], 256.

Quotations from *Sāhbuhragān* were known a long time ago from al-Bīrūnī's *Āṭār*³⁰; in the Islamic period (cf. Reeves 1992, 40) a volume was known in *Xvārizm*, which contained the

31 *Pragmateia* and *Gospel* (*wnglywn) bear their Greek names, undoubtedly, given to these works by Māri himself; this evidence is important for evaluating the impact of the Greek language in the 3rd century Mesopotamia. However, the name of *Pragmateia* is not even mentioned in Iranian Manichaean texts. The name probably means "stories", cf. Tardieu 1982, 55.

32 The Book of Giants, Kāwān, Māni wrote at request of the Parthians, cf. S3nhuhragšn. The Enoch literature must be contained material close to, but not identical with, that of S3nhuhragšn. The Enoch literature must be the main source of this work (cf. Reeves 1992); the mention of "Parthians" in the connection of Kāwān may be a result of a linguistic error, as Persian pahlawān (from the ethnic name of the Parthians, "a hero, a strong man" > Arabic etc. bahlawān) is, to some degree, synonymous with Kaw. In other Manichaean Iranian literatures the name of our giants / abortions is also derived from an Avestan term: it is kavi, "a giant here of old", meaning "a poet" in Vedic. The equation of the Genesis term gibbor (Aramaic gi[n][b]ārā) / kavi seems to be existing before Māni, cf. Widengren 1960, 48. In Manichaean Middle Persian "mazan" is used to translate Greek ἵγας, "giant", cf. Pahlavi "mazan(īg)" [e.g., Ahirman mazaniḡān Az spahbed, "the giant-demons of Ahriman, Az (Concupiscence) the commander-in-chief", WZs 35.35, Molé 1963, 96; Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 134-5], Sogdian "Mzyny'n dyw", rendering the Avestan adj. *mazania-, "glant" applied to "daevas". Cf. Māzandarān in the anti-Manichaean passages of Skand Gumānig Wizār, rendering Nephilim, "giants / abortions" [in the double meaning of Hebrew נַפְלִימוֹ: "fallen angels [> giants] / abortions", cf. Sundermann 1994b, where J.Ch. Greenfield is quoted], restored also by Sundermann in M 5900 (m'zndr'n = Giants, Sundermann 1989, 71 n. 38; Reeves 1993, 161 n. 392). These "Māzandarān", who were glossed over as "demons", are actually "giants", cf. also Russell 1985, 456. This use of an old Avestan term, ethnic in its character cf. (Burrow 1973, 134-6), as an application to imported Jewish Nephilim, is typical for Māni's system of thought; but, it is also the usage of some Pahlavi texts, derived from St[?]t dgar Nask (Molé 1959, 282ff.); Māzandarān as a demonic term is used several times in MX, written down in Sasanian times; the White Dēw [cf. Reeves, op. cit., 1993, 161 n. 392, and Sundermann, op. cit., 1994, 456 n. 100, and especially, for the term "White Dēw": "light, luminous", "conspicuous, pure, clean, ... as the sun and stars, ..."] of S3nhmah still dwells in Māzandarān; in DKM S94 "The Great dēw" (dyw mzn > mzndr[?]) was destroyed by Hōšang, while Tabarāt calls him līlīs (Tafazzoli 1969, 117). The Iranian tradition still uses "Great Satan" and "Small Satan" as political/ethnic abuses. The circle gets closed: an ethnic name got the meaning "demons", and the word for "demon" became an ethnic slur.

33 It should be noted that *Sāhbuhragān* was, presumably, not a part of the Eastern (Parthian-Sogdian-Uiguric-Chinese) Manichaean Canon.

34 Editions: Müller 1904, 11-24; Salemann 1908, 24-28; partial edition: Boyce 1975, 76-81 [text z, M 473, 475, 477, 482, 472, 470]; studies: {Afric 1919, 161-97}; Jackson 1930; Ghilain 1947, 539f.; Henning 1952, 516-7; Boyce 1960, 31-2; Boyce 1968b, 70; translations: Müller 1904; Ghilain 1947 [a partial one, by Andreas]; Asmussen 1975, 103-106.

29 On the rôle of the Aramaean Nûh-zādag and Mānī's ability to speak Middle Persian and/or Parthian, cf. Widengren 1983a, 971, and n. 6.

30 Sachau 1923, 207, 14-18; Sachau 1879, 190; Adam 1969, 5-8 =/– Keph. 1, for a parallel; cf. Boyce 1975a, 29, notes; Sahrestānī (ed. Cureton) 192; Adam 1969, 6, text b; Hutter 1988, 159-160.

There are many Aramaic features in Manichaean Middle Iranian texts: in some Manichaean fragments from the Book of Giants we find Aramaic ܩܝܡܬܐ³⁵ for "Watchers" of Aramaic Enoch; the word goes back to the Aramaic parts of Daniel. And there is the well-known now (cf. Reeves 1991, 296) example of Aramaic ܚܬܝܬܐ, "sin", for "semen", resulting, partly, from a connection with ܚܬܝܬܐ, "to abort", as a part of the Aramaic-Gnostic parlance³⁶, used in the texts; if this, or similar, usage was found in Iranian, this should be regarded as a semantic calque [compare sub-chapter I. "Sleep and Sweat"].

There are words whose range in meaning in Western Iranian and Semitic³⁷ is close or identical, due probably to a common background and long period of contacts. In many cases it is impossible to decide in which language the sense of a given word is original. To these belongs Middle Persian, etc. ܡܝܪܝܬ, identical with Aramaic/Hebrew TQN / TKN, "to repair, to arrange, to compose" etc. Both words are mutually fully translatable, while we use in modern languages more than one verb to render all the shades of their meanings. This mutual translatability of Iranian and Semitic words might sometimes blur our judgment as to Mānī's sources or the original language of some given pieces. How easy Mānī's work in picking up his Iranian vocabulary sometimes was can be demonstrated by the example of his word for resurrection: Mānī chose existing Zoroastrian terms to render his Aramaic vocabulary. The Pahlavi term for "resurrection", "the rising of the dead", *ristāxēz*, contains the word for "dead", *ristā*, and the verbal root "to stand up, to arise" (on the vocalization *ristāxēz* in Manichaean Middle Persian, cf. MacKenzie's notes in his edition of *Sānbuhragān*³⁸).

35 In *status absolutus*! But this is also the case with many "Syriac" (i.e., Syriac and Aramaic) loan words in Armenian, many of which were borrowed centuries later.

36 Cf. D. Shapira, "The Jews, Celestial Race" (forthcoming).

37 Under "Semitic" I understand here almost exclusively Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of Western Asia from the epoch corresponding, on the Iranian side, to that from the Median Empire until the Islamic conquests.

38 Tafazzoli 1974b, 339 mentioned also the vocalization of the word *ristāxēz* in Zoroastrian Middle Persian and Manichaean Middle Persian, against *rustāxēz* in Fārs and *rāstāxēz* in New Persian. Bayānu- ܡܝܪܝܬ by ܐܠܝܐܠܝܐ has: "(a)bē-gumān hēm pa(d) hastīh ī Hormazd u Amšpandān, <pa(d)> rustāxēz", as a phrase told by a Mōbad in a fire-temple in Fārs to Muqqadastī, after showing him a copy of the Avesta and reading a passage from it; this New Persian passage was compared to the two extant Middle Persian ones: *pa(d) hastīh <ī> Yazdān ... ud ristāxēz ... abē-gumān hom*, PT, 87 §4, and ... *ud būdan ī ristāxēz ... abē-gumān būdan*, PT 44 § 16, Tafazzoli 1974b, 339.

its Aramaic counterpart is *qayāmtā* / *qayāmtā* [dāmīē], or, in a shorter form, simply *qayāmtā* / *qayāmtā*, which may be a calque from Iranian³⁹, though no longer felt⁴⁰ as such. This Aramaic *qayāmtā* / *qayāmtā* (the Syriac word means also "ecclesia, covenant, law, convent"⁴¹) was later borrowed into Arabic as *qiyāmat*-. The Arabic word, in its turn, made a semantic impact on the New Persian continuation of the Pahlavi word, as reflected in the New Persian pronunciation *rāstāxēz*, vs. Pahlavi *ristāxēz*, implying "the rising of the righteous [*rāst*]"⁴², or, "the rising-up [*rāst*]", having been adapted to Arabic semantics.

In other cases, an Iranian word was used as a clear calque from Semitic. It can be easily illustrated by the Manichaean use of *drōd* as a word for "greeting", in the sense of Aramaic, Hebrew etc. *šālāmā*, *šālōm* etc. (cf. Pelliot M. 914.2.3, de Menasce 1971b, 305-6): ܡܝܪܝܬ ܡܝܪܝܬ ܡܝܪܝܬ, "tu est venu dans paix", clearly a calque from Aramaic ܡܝܪܝܬ ܡܝܪܝܬ ܡܝܪܝܬ⁴³. Mānī's use of the word "West"⁴⁴ as a designation the land in which Jesus appeared as a messenger may reflect a specific - and well-attested - Jewish-Babylonian⁴⁵ expression for the Land of Israel (*ma'rābā*).

39 The idea of resurrection of the dead is of course Iranian. In the Jewish sources it was first attested in Ezechiel, Achæmenid epoch.

40 The Christian Pahlavi usage (SGW 15.61) was *rōz ī āxēzišn*, perhaps a back-translation from Syriac.

41 Cf. Brockelmann 1928, 653b.

42 In Iran, "dead" and "righteous" were frequently seen as synonymous, cf. Shapira 1997 (I hope to return to this topic elsewhere); meanwhile, it is worth notice that in Sasanian Iran, a person executed by a Zoroastrian court of law, was supposed to become "righteous" and worthy of the Best Existence, in case he wholeheartedly repented his mortal sin, cf. *Sāyast nē šāyast* 8.6, Tavadia 1930, 106: *ud agar rad sar brīdan framāyēd, pa(d) gyāg ahlaw, ud satōš ō yazīšn*, "and if *ratu* orders to cut his (the sinner's) head, he (the sentenced person) becomes "righteous" on the spot, and the *satōš* ceremony is to be celebrated". The Jewish idea *mīšāṭ kappārāṭ/taqqānāṭ*, "his death is his atonement/correction", found elsewhere, may serve as a parallel.

43 Schaefer 1926 quoted an Aramaic poem composed presumably by Mānī preserved by Bar Konay in the 11th book of his *Katābā* *dāEskōlyōn* (ed. Pognon p. 128:5ff; CSCO Script. Syr. II Vol. 66 p. 314:20ff.):

ܡܝܪܝܬ ܡܝܪܝܬ	Er sprach [der Lebendige Geist] zu ihm [dem Urmenschen]:
ܫܝܡ ܝܝܟ ܬܒ ܕܒܝܬ ܒܝܬ	"Friede über dich, Guter, inmitten der Bösen,
....	

ܬܒ ܒܫܝܡ ܡܝܬ	"Komm zu Heil, bringend
ܬܒܝܪܬ ܫܝܢ ܡܝܬ	die Schiffslast von Frieden und Heil".

The translation in Adam 1969, 18, is different. Cf. also Widengren 1950, 94-95.

44 BTRŪNĪ (cf. Sachau 1923, 207.17) also used *Ma'rāb* in his quotation from Mānī's *Sānbuhragān*.

45 It is quite possible that not only Jews, but also other speakers of Aramaic in Babylonia designated Palestine, Phoenicia et cetera as "the West". I, however, am aware only of the Jewish usage. The later speakers of Syriac in the Nestorian East and the Monophysite/Monophysite West may have lost the sense of their cultural unity and thus lost the need to refer to each other by geographical, rather than religious, designations.

Mānī's "Religion of Light" may derive its designation from a Jewish tradition: it is only among Jews, of all the speakers of Aramaic, that a bilingual pun was possible, juxtaposing the words for "light" and "Religious Teaching", namely, ܡܪܝܬܐ, the Jewish Aramaic for ܬܠܝܬܐ. Though Aramaic ܡܪܝܬܐ and the Hebrew ܬܠܝܬܐ are both derived from the same root for "to teach", Aramaic ܡܪܝܬܐ was frequently understood as containing the Hebrew ܠܝܬ, "light", which is impossible in Standard Aramaic or in Syriac, where another root for "light" was used. The Hebrew saying, no doubt based on this Hebrew-Aramaic pun, states: ܬܠܝܬܐ ܗܝ ܠܝܬ, "the ܬܠܝܬܐ is [the] Light". It was thus perhaps from this Jewish tradition that Mānī derived the name "Books of Light", cf. Keph 5.23.

The Manichaean use of Iranian *šhr* in *nwg šhr* embodying a conception of the New Paradise as the New Aion as well, due to the dual meaning of the Syriac word ܥܠܡܐ, "world, age, αἰών"⁴⁶, was noted many years ago by Mary Boyce (cf. Boyce 1954, 16 n. 7). It was the temporal aspect of the Semitic word that preceded the spatial one⁴⁷. The choice of this particular Iranian word *šhr*, to render ܥܠܡܐ, indicates perhaps Mānī's acquaintance with Iranian legendary history as reflected in some Nasks abbreviated in the Dēnkard: "šhr of NN", "the rulership of NN", was understood as "age of NN", and then the same *šhr* was introduced to render the concept of "world". Thus, we find in the *Sāhbuhragān*: ܡܢ ܕܪ ܫܗܪ, "in the world".

Skjærvø 1996b, 241, called the use of the verb *wift-* (*wiyift-*) "deceive, lead astray" "especially noteworthy", as it applies "both to the deceived worshipers and to the idols themselves". In my opinion, this usage is a semantic calque from the Aramaic ܬܥܝܬ, "to go astray, wonder, err", from which the substantive ܬܥܝܬܐ is formed, applied to idols and idolatry, whence Arabic ܬܥܝܬ. In some cases, it is only the translation back into Aramaic that enables us to reach a better understanding of Mānī's intention, as in M 18, "[in] truth [he] is the Son of God"⁴⁸, where the Aramaic version could be easily reconstructed as *šrr- hw br- d'lh-, • šrr- vocalised *šarāṣ[ā], "truth" or *šarīṣ[ā], "power" (δυναμικ).

46 But also in Christian Pahlavi: SGW 15.118: šmāh az ēn šāhr hēd, man nē azāš hom, "you are of this *world/aion*, but I am not of it", cf. John 8.23.

47 The (rather late) development of Semitic ܥܠܡܐ, ܥܠܡܐ, ܥܠܡܐ from "(eternal) time" to "world" is due perhaps to the impact of Persian gāh, which has three meanings: "place, throne, time". In passing, note the Persian semantics of the Aramaic loan word in Armenian, at'or, "throne".

48 Cf. Möller 1904, 34-6; interpreted by Alfarić as part of Mānī's *Living Gospel*, studied in Tolman 1919; readings improved in Klimkeit 1989, 401ff.

In the last case, the original reading was "the Son of God is strong", being, in my view, an allusion to the words of John the Baptist in Mt 3.10.

It is Mānī's Judæo-Christian background that makes possible to explain a problematic word in the *Sāhbuhragān*. The *demons-tormentor*, dyw'n [ny]xrwst'r, was restored in *Sāhbuhragān* 33-34 & 206, cf. MacKenzie 1979, 523. MacKenzie told us that Mānī's own designation of the Adversary of the Fiend means "tormentor", not "reproacher"; he rejected the older translation ("the verbal noun ... must be something stronger than mere rebuke, reproach"), arguing that there are two partly synonymous verbs, i: nxrwhd, nxrwh-, "reproach", < Old Persian *ni-xrauθ-, Avestan xraos-, and ii: nyxrwst, nyxrwsh-, "torment", < *ni-xraud-, the two to be put apart in Boyce 1977, 99. But even if MacKenzie's postulation about the existence of two "partly synonymous verbs" is wrong on the Iranian part (and I believe, it is not), we are able, nevertheless, to strengthen MacKenzie's view about the range of meaning of the verb in question by a parallel from Mānī's own linguistical background.

Zecharia 3.2⁴⁹ was frequently used for magic purposes, thus one may expect Mānī to have been acquainted with it. Magic in Babylonia was an international business, easily crossing religious and cultural boundaries. Many magical texts were composed by Jews for Gentiles, while using Jewish, including Biblical, formulae, sometimes in Hebrew, sometimes translated into Aramaic.

The Zacharia text reads yiq'ar YHWH bākā haššāṭān (the Syriac version reads: Sāṭānā neq'or bāk Maryā, in King James's Version, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan")⁵⁰.

The original Hebrew has here the verb gā'ar, generally rendered as "to rebuke". The more exact range of the meaning of the Hebrew word was studied in Macintosh 1961; in Genesis Apocryphon, e.g. (cf. Beyer 1984, 176), one finds: wk'cn šly 'ly w'l byty w'ttq'c mnh rwh' d' b'yšt' wšly 'lwhy ... w'ttq'c mnh rwh' d' b'yšt', "and now pray for me and for my wife (byty, "my house"), that this evil spirit may be expelled from us... and I (Abraham) prayed for him ... and the evil spirit was expelled from him (the Pharaoh)". A shade of the Hebrew meaning of gā'ar here survives, in my opinion, in its original meaning, in the Syro-Palestinian Arabic ka'ar, "to reject, to expel"⁵¹. It was this double sense, "rebuke" /

49 The Book of Zecharia belongs to the Persian Period and is full of Iranian material; the idea of *Satan*, as is well known, was not originally Jewish, thus the locus is *a priori* suspected of Iranian influence.

50 Cf. Naveh & Shaked 1987, A1.5-6 (pp. 40-1) and B11.5-6 (pp. 184-5), where the orthography is vulgar and differs considerably from the Massoretic text.

51 Macintosh 1961 made references to Egyptian and Syrian Arabic colloquialisms, but not to this particular word; cf. also haṭṭ bik'ār lān, "he pursued/haunted one".

"reject"⁵², of the Biblical verse (cf. MacKenzie's "reproach" / "torment") that was rendered by Mānī as [ny]xrwst⁵³.

Another group of Mānī's terms has no possible Semitic equivalents and must thus reflect Iranian notions current in Mānī's times. To this group belongs the important term *dēnwar*, translated by MacKenzie as "religious". This highly interesting term ultimately goes back to Mānī's "Iranian", not "Semitic", background. There is no indigenous Semitic word for "religion" in our modern sense: New Hebrew for "religion", *dāt*, is a Late Old Persian/Archaic Middle Persian loan word⁵⁴; Aramaic (whence Hebrew and Arabic) *dīn*, results from a contamination of *daēnā* > *dīn* with homonymous Semitic for "judgment" [cf. in Introduction]⁵⁵. There is no Semitic word I could think of that would stand behind Mānī's *dīnwar*. The term does not seem to have been coined by Mānī, but existed before him and was used by him. However, it does not occur in Iranian sources that could be dated ante Mānī. The word *dīn*, in two senses: 1), "religion" (*mazdēenne*) and 2), "*dēn* (double eschatologique)", occurs only in Middle Persian inscriptions of Kirdēr⁵⁶ (cf. Gignoux 1972, 22). No doubt, Mānī's perception of *dēnwar* was connected with his own "twin reflection", and *dēnwar* must be translated not as "religious", but as "righteous", "one bearing⁵⁷ the image of his good *daēnā* in his own soul", "one who shall see a beautiful *daēnā*" or the like, as only the righteous ones will see her in glory. Syriac for "ecclesia", *ʿēdā* / *ʿīdā*, from Hebrew *ʿēdāh*, "community", was used in a very interesting sense in the Hymn of the Bride preserved in Acts of Thomas. The Hymn begins: *ʿdty brt nwhr* *zyw* *dmik* *ʿyt* *lh*, where the Greek reads: *ἡ κόρη τοῦ φωτός θυγάτηρ* etc., "The Ecclesia/Bride is the daughter of Light".

52 Prof. Sh. Shaked and Prof. J. Naveh kindly drew my attention to the fact that the late Prof. J.Ch. Greenfield wrote on this word. In fact, Greenfield 1980, xxxviii-xxxix, came to the same conclusions about the meaning of the word in the Hebrew Bible ("roar, rebuke" / "to turn back, drive out") and in Aramaic magic contexts ("to drive out"). I am thankful to them for that remark.

53 Though it is not impossible that Mānī knew some Hebrew, nevertheless, this particular example does not necessarily imply it, as the Syriac and Aramaic use of the word in this formula may have been known also to people who did know no Hebrew at all. It is of interest that the same Iranian verb was used by Mānī's arch-enemy Kirdēr in KKZ 13f., as was noted in MacKenzie 1979, 523: *ʿPm nhlwsty HWHd*, "and I tormented them".

54 No longer felt as such at a very early stage, as it was introduced into the present Biblical text of Deuteronomy 33.2, which, whatever the dating, is still older than the Achæmenid period.

55 So, *yōmā* *q-dīnā* might mean "the day on which one meets his own *daēnā*".

56 A special study undertaken by me has shown that there are many parallels between Mānī's and Kirdēr's texts; my conclusion is that Kirdēr was forced to use the parlance created by Mānī. I hope to publish my results in the future.

57 Cf. Sundermann 1996, 418b: "Old Iranian *-bara-* 'carrying,' rather than ... *ʿabar-* 'to bring'."

The extant Syriac version was seen as departing considerably from the original text, due to its systematic *catholicizing effort*, thus "Bride" was replaced by "Church" in the Syriac version. However, if one substitutes the Iranian *dēn* for *ʿēdā* / *ʿīdā* and *ḥ kōrā*, both notions become synonymous.⁵⁸

After these remarks on the vocabulary of Mānī's *Šāhbuhragān*, we will turn to a comparison of several passages of this work with some Zoroastrian Pahlavi passages preserved in books whose final redaction is centuries later than Mānī's epoch. However, the similarities between both groups entitle one to suggest that these passages were known to Mānī and to his Zoroastrian readers/hearers⁵⁹ in some form, and, moreover, that Mānī made efforts to make it clear that he refers to familiar Zoroastrian lore, with the aim to disguise his teachings and to pass them as a better exposition of Zoroastrianism. First of all, Mānī's *Šāhbuhragān* was entitled *dw bwn*, "two bases/origins", and it is tempting to compare this name to that of Bundahišn (though this name and its age is problematic). Mānī wrote in his *Šāhbuhragān* (MacKenzie 1979, 504-5) A 10-16:

*h'nc ʿw ʿwyš'n hnzps'd. w ʿwy zm'n k' ʿnd[r] šhr xyr ʿynwn bw'd * ʿy[gy]
pc zmyg w ʿsm'n ʿwd (x)[wr] ʿwd m'h w ʿxtr'n [ʿwd] [ʿ]st[ʿ]rg'n wzrg
nyš'n pyd[ʿg] b[w]ʿd **.*

"...will also join himself to them. And at that time, when things⁶⁰ will be thus in the world⁶¹, [then] also on earth and in heaven, and on the sun and moon, and in the constellations (of the zodiac) and the stars, a great sign will appear".

Though these ideas could be easily explained as taken from the apocalyptic fragments of the New Testament, nevertheless, it is plausible to suggest that Mānī did refer on purpose to Zoroastrian passages like that preserved in ZWY 6.4:

58 Cf. Sundermann 1996, 418b, on the abstract Parthian *dēnāšarift*, "understood as a collective designation for the Manichean church as a whole".

59 Presumably, to *Šāhpuhr*.

60 *x y r* is a semantic calque from Aramaic *ʿābū*, "thing; desire"; *CBW* (**ʿābū*) was used in Pahlavi as an Aramæogram for *xēr*.

61 As already mentioned, *ʿndr šhr*, "in the world", a semantic calque from Aramaic *ʿālamā*.

ka bē āyēnd, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št, xvaršēd nēzm nišān nimāyēd, ud māh
az gōnag wardēd pad gēhān nēzm ud tom tārigīh bawēd pad asmān nišānag ī
gōnag.gōnag paydāg bawēd ud būm.candag was bawēd ud wād stahmag.tar⁶²
āyēd ud pad gēhān niyāz ud tangīh ud dušxvārīh wēš ō dēdār āyēd ud Tilgīr
ud Ohrmazd wad tar.ān rāy pādixšāhīh rāyēnēnd,

"O Spitāmān Zoroaster! When they will come, the Sun will be veiled⁶³, the Moon will
change color and there will be haze, darkness and gloom on earth, various signs will become
manifest in the sky, there will be many earthquakes, the wind will blow stronger, much need,
distress and misfortune will appear on earth, and Mercury and Jupiter will determine the
sovereignty to the wicked".

Sāhbuhragān (MacKenzie 1979, 504-5) A 9-10 (w dynwr ky x[wyš] dyn ny
wrw'd, "and the "religious" who may not believe in his own religion") finds its parallel in
ZWY 4.53⁶⁴: ū.šān pad hān ī x^vēš dēn nē wurōyēnd, "they will not believe in their
own religion".

Sāhbuhragān (MacKenzie 1979, 504-5) A r 17-18 (ps xrdyšhr yzd h'n ky nxwst
wy nr d'm, "then Xradēšahr (the god of the world of wisdom) who first that male creation...")
should be compare to Bd 1a.6 [cf. APPENDIX II Fragān]:

nazdist asmān dād, rōšn paydāg, ī abēr dūr.*kanārag, xāyag.dēs, x^vān.āhēn
ī hast gōhr almāst, nr.

"first, He (Ohrmazd, the "Lord Wisdom") created Sky, bright and manifest, with extremely
remote boundaries, in the shape of an egg, of shining metal that is the substance of steel, male".

⁶² Cereti 1995, 141: *stambagtar*.

⁶³ With Cereti 1995, 160 n. 34.

⁶⁴ Thus assuming that this Zoroastrian passage not necessarily reflects latter vicissitudes of the
Zoroastrian Church, but is rather an old literary topos.

Sāhbuhragān (MacKenzie 1979, 504-507) A v 17 (41)-24 (48) indicates that the idea
of "angels/messengers" was not unfamiliar to Mānī's Zoroastrian audience:

ʔwd ps [xrd]yšhr yzd prystg'n ʔw [xwrʔ]s'n ʔwd ʔw xwrnw'r [pryst]ʔd w
šw'nd ʔwd mrdwhm [ʔy d]ynwr ʔb'g hy'r'n' * w h'n [dwš]qyrdg'n [n] ʔz
h'mkw(ny)š'n [hmys pr'c ʔw pyl]š xrdyšhr yzd n'ynd ʔ'wš nm'c br'nd,

"and then god Xradēšahr will send messengers to east and west, and they will go and [bring] the
religious with (their) helpers, and those wicked ones [together] with (their) accomplices,
before Xradēšahr".

The meanings of New Persian for "angel", *ferestē* (Parthian *frystg*, Armenian *hrestak*)
and for "messenger, ambassador"⁶⁵, *fereste* (Middle Persian *prystk/frystg*, Aramaic and
Syriac *prystq*) must antedate the Islamic period: two Arabic words for "messenger" cannot be
good candidates, as Arabic *mal'ak* is a loan word from Aramaic, having no etymology in Arabic,
while Arabic *rasūl* is a calque from ṣāliḥ / ἀποστολος though word-lists to Manichaean texts
register *frystg/frystg* as "apostle, angel", however, the contexts I was able to check do not
support the meaning "angel". In fact, there is not much room in Mānī's mythology for "angels".
The only occurrence of the word in question in the sense of "angel" I am aware of is that found in
Sāhbuhragān (MacKenzie 1979, 508-9) C v 5 (125): [gh]y prystg'n ʔbr ʔwyš'n
[dw]šqyrdg'n gwm'r(yd) ʔwšn [g]yr'nd w ʔw dwšwx ʔ(bg)[n'nd], "then he
(Xradēšahr) appoints angels over those evil-doers, and they seize them and cast them into
hell".

We should remember that Mānī's hearer/reader was no other than the King of Kings; Mānī's
personages should be familiar to him. Thus, Mānī wisely refers to the god of the world of wisdom
Xradēšahryazd, "who first made that male creation", implying that Sāhpuhr would
comprehend that Xradēšahryazd is, of course, the well-familiar "Lord Wisdom", who
created, in the beginning, the male Sky.

⁶⁵ But also *ferestāde* for *rasūl*, nabī.

So, using here *prystgʷn*, "angels", Mānī could be sure that he will be understood by the King. And indeed, in a Pahlavi text, which, according to Boyce 1985b, 473a, would be a Parthian *zand*, i.e., a text that already had existed about Mānī's time, namely in Dk 7.4.74-78 (DkM 639.17ff.; Molé 1967, 56-7), we read:

74. *frēstīd cand dādār ī Ohrmazd wahman, Ašwahišt, āta(x)š ī abzōnīg pad ašt[ag]īh...*

77. *ūš guft pad hān ī wirān gōwišnīh āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd kū: "mā tars! cēt nē abar tarsīšn, warzāwand ī Kay Wištāsp! nēt ō mān tarist mad hēnd aštāg⁶⁶ abargar ī paygāmbar ī Arjāsp, ūt nē ō mān tarist mad hēnd dō hāwand⁶⁷ Arjāsp kē sāg ud bāz xʷahēnd ūt nē ō mān tarist mad hēnd hān ī harwisp tarwēnīdār duz ī xʷāstār gadag ī rāhdārī*

78. *se hēm kēt ō mān tarist mad hēnd: Wahman, Ašwahišt, āta(x)šēz ī xʷadāy ī abzōnīg ...".*

74. Ohrmazd sent as messengers Wahman, Ašwahišt and the bountiful fire...

77. The Fire of Ohrmazd said in a human voice: "Do not be afraid! Because there is nothing for you to be afraid of, O powerful Kay Wištāsp! Those who have come to your abode are not messengers of Arjāsp! Those who have come to your abode are not two similar to Arjāsp, wishing tribute and revenue! Those who have come to your abode are not all-conquering (men), greedy thieves, or highwaymen!"

78. We are three who have come to your abode: Wahman, Ašwahišt, and also the bountiful Fire of the Lord ...".

66 Cf. Yt 19.46 (āšt), where Dahāka and Spitāmēta Yimōkərānt, "the one who sawed Yima" (cf. Bd 33.1, "dēw who sawed Yim"), both Ahriman's messengers, are mentioned together.

67 Or, Xyōn, Hyonites; cf. West 1897, 68.

In § 77 two Pahlavi synonyms are used, *aštāg* *abargar* and *paygāmbar*; *abargar* probably reflects Avestan *uparō.kairiia-*, Vd 19.13, 16 (cf. Molé 1967, 187); the normal Pahlavi meaning of *abargar* is "god, divinity" (cf. Bd 18.16). It is possible that the semantics of this word were similar to those of Greek *αγγελος* or Hebrew *malʾāk*. The point is that the idea of a non-human being serving as God's messenger was no news to the King (both to Wištāsp and to Šāhpuhr).

Another fragment from Mānī's work makes a clear reference to a problematic Zoroastrian *Zand*. The fragment in question is Šāhbuhragān (MacKenzie 1979, 504-5) A 1-9:

*pd dywʷn ʷwd ...]bw[]](c)[](p)tg (kw)[](d)nd w gwʷnd [kw ʷ]mh [y]zdʷn
pyysgr hwm ** (...m...) pd ʷyn pnd ʷyg ʷmh [] mrdwmʷn prʷyst wyps[ʷnd] ʷwšʷn
pd dwšqyrdgʷny[h] qʷm rwʷnd,*

"... with demons and ... will ... and say, "We are the agents of the gods"⁶⁸. [You should go] in this path of ours". Mankind will mostly be deceived and will proceed according to their (the false prophets') will to do evil".

The corresponding passage is included in Dk 9.32 (DkM 835-841; cf. West 1892, 252-60⁶⁹), which is supposed to be a commentary on the Xʷadamēd (Xʷaētumaitī Hāltī) fragard of the Warštāmsār Nask. This fragard is a commentary on Y 32, the S[t]ūdgār and Bag Nasks versions are given in Dk 9.9 and Dk 9.54 respectively. The beginning of this commentary in the Warštāmsār Nask version, being a very free paraphrase of PY 32, indicates that the Zandists defended fiercely the idea that the forces of evil who punish the transgressors are not Ohrmazd's agents. Dk 9.32.1-3 is as follows:

68 *yīzdān payēsgar*, "teachers".

69 Dk 9.32.14-22 (DkM 838.20-840.12) transcribed and translated in Molé 1967, 208-9; Dk 9.32.23 (DkM 840.12-17) transcribed and translated in Molé 1967, 211; several passages were treated in Molé 1963, 225 (Dk 9.32.12), 227 (Dk 9.32.13), 228 (Dk 9.32.19).

1. nahom fragard xʷadamēd abar madan ī 3 dēw [ī] frēitag ud lābakkārīh ī ōhrmazd kū pad hān lābag awēšān menād ud mizdēnād ud ō zōr īšān pad murnjēnīdān ī dāmān rasād.

2. awēšān dēwān az zufrāy ō burz lābag ēwāzīhā axʷārd xāyūg *ēwag kū xʷēšīh ī adrūjīšn ud ēwagaz kū wālanīh ī adrūjīšn ēwag kū ērmānīh ī adrūjīšn hād im guft pad ēn kū: "hān mēnōg hēm ka xʷēš ērmān ud wālan ēwag abāg did mihr nē drōzēnd amāh nē ēnāz kū nē abzār ī tō hēm. ūmān dēn dād hān [ī] tō ud kāmāg ī tō kunēm ud kē tō dōst ayār ud kē tō dušman wizanddār bawēm [ud] kē tō xʷāhēm gāh ī andar hān ī pahlom axʷān mīzd ī mīzd arzānīgān.

3. pasaxʷ ī ōhrmazd ō awēšān kū: "bē dušaxʷāg dwāred ō bun ī hān *aryandtum⁷⁰ edōn ēmāh harwisp az dēw hēd ūtān az Akōmanāz [hast] tōhmag kūtān tōhmag az ānōh kū Akōman ud Waranāz ī abeshīnīdār ud āzaz ī hušbār⁷¹ ud Indarəz ī kūšīdār dēn ī mēnōg ī ahlamoīh ud frāz frēbēd mardom [ī] gētīg pad huzīwēnišn ud a.marg.rawīšnīh ud menišn awēšān fradom bē banded".

70 Spelled Aklwnd; Akiyy. ayrē, stands for Avestan ayr̥ya-; Middle and New Persian aryand. It seems, however, that the passage is derived from Pvd 19.47, where one finds ō bun ī axʷān ī tom kē ērang Dušaxʷ, with ērang standing for Avestan ar̥yatō. On this basis, it would be proper to emend our Dk passage and to translate it: "to Hell ... to the source of the wicked [of] darkness (*ērang *ī *tom)".

71 Zaehner 1955, 171: āzaz ī anhanbār, "insatiate".

1. The ninth fragard, Xvaētumaiti, is about the coming of three deceitful demons, and their lamenting to Ōhrmazd, that He, through this lament, should consider and reward them and join (Himself) to their power to destroy the creatures.

2. These demons *vomited *saliva by clamorous supplication from the abyss⁷² upwards, one that he is the family that is undeceitful, another one that he is the community that is undeceitful, and of the third one that he is the clan that is undeceitful, saying that, namely: "We are that spirit when the members of a family, a community, a clan do not break promises, one with the other; are we not really Thy tools? Our religion and law are Thine, and we do Thy will; we assist those who are Thy friends, and we injure those who are Thy enemies; we are those who ask Thee of a position in the best existence, the reward that is a reward of the worthy".

3. The reply of Ōhrmazd to them was thus: "You rush out to Hell, to this most horrible source, as you are all from demon(s) and your seed is really from Akōman (Evil Thought), i.e., your seed is from there where Akōman (Evil Thought) and Waran (Lust) the destroyer and also Az (Greed) the Swallower, and Indr the Slayer, too, (are), the spirit(s) of the religion of heresy. You deceive the worldly people as to good life and propagation of immortality and you first tight up their minds".

72 Cf. i Enoch 10:13, abyss of fire as place of punishment; OrgWld 126:22-23, 34 (the "gods" – abortions are to be cast down to abyss), Tartaros below the Abyss (HypArch 95:12); Earth as prison of demons in Traité manichéen, cf. Chavannes & Pelliot 1913, 514-5, 528.

The unnamed demons complain that, although they do Ohrmazd's job and will and are his tools (abzār), they do not get, nevertheless, their reward. They go on and complain that Ohrmazd does not add to their power to destroy (His, presumably, wicked) creatures, who later implicitly are called Ohrmazd's enemies; they also tell that they are of Ohrmazd's Religion. No, answers Ohrmazd, you do it on your own, it is your evil nature that pushes you to the destruction of your own Evil Realm. From Ohrmazd's answer it is clear that the three unnamed demons have some specific links with Waran, Az, Indr, who are also mentioned in the S[t]ūdgār commentary of Y 32, namely Dk 9.9.1; they could be even identical with these. Their sin is described as leading astray as to "good life" and "immortality" (huztWēnišn ud a.marg.rawišnīh).

The Dk account is supposed to be based on PY 32.1, which reads:

Axīlācā xVaešuš yāsaḵ ahlīā varəzənam maḵ arlīamā
ahlīā daēuūā mahmī mandī ahuraḥlīā uruūzəmə⁷³ mazdā
əḥḥi dūtāghō āghāmā tāng dārafiō yōi va daibīšəntī.

Compare a few translations of this passage:

"And (for bliss) from him shall the nobility beg; from him the community with (its) sodality; from him, (even) the daēva-adherents {daēuūā} - on my terms {mahmī mandī}, for bliss {uruūzəmə} from Ahura the wise. (People:) Let us be messengers {dūtāghō} for (your) strengthening {əḥḥi}; for restraining those who are-hostile-to you (Wilkins Smith 1929);

"(to the gods). At my insistence {mahmī mandī}, ye gods, the family, the community together with the clan, entreated for the grace of Him {uruūzəmə}, the Wise Lord, (saying:) "Let us be Thy messengers, in order to hold back those who are inimical to you" (Insler 1975);

"The family entreats, the community along with the tribe (do so) in my recital {mahmī mandī⁷⁴}, O you Daēvas, (entreating) for His, the Wise Ahura's favour: "Let us be Thy households {əḥḥi dūtāghō⁷⁵ āghāmā}. Thou breakest up (the groupings of) those who hate You" (Humbach 1991);

"In my recital, O Daēvas, the family and the community along with the tribe ask for His, Mazdā Ahura's, favor (by praying): "Let us be your people. You scatter those who are hostile to you" (Humbach & Ichaporia 1994);

"Of Him have they sought - family, community together with the clan, Of Him, o false gods, at my inspiration {mahmī mandī}; His, the Wise Lord's blessing: "May we be Your messengers, to hold back those that hate You" (Schwartz 1986, 339).

73 Schwartz 1986: *vrāzəmə.

74 *mana* being a technical term (Humbach 1991, II, 77).

75 Generally connected with Vedic dūtā-, "messenger", but must be equated with dūd, dūdāg, "smoke", hearth, family" (Humbach 1991, II, 77).

Its Pahlavi version is as follows:

hān [gyān] ī awē pad xVēšīh xVāst hān ī awē wālanth⁷⁶ abāg ērmānīh
[hān mīzd ī Ohrmazd xVēš dēwān pad ēn kū wālah ud ērmān ī tō hēm ə.šān ōh
xVāst]

hān ī awē dēwān pad mān menišnīh [kūmān menišn ēdōn frārōn ciyōn
Zardu[x]št] hān ī Ohrmazd urwāhmīh [ə.šān ōh xVāst]

tō gōwāg⁷⁷ bawēm [kū rāyēnīdār ī tō bawēm] awēšān dārem kē šmāh
bešēnēnd [kū.šān az šmāh abaz dārem].

76 This word (translated by West 1892, 252: "serf, serfdom") means "community etc."; it translates (cf. Dhabhar 1949, Glossary, 168) varəzəna- (which was differently rendered: wərzīšn, wālanth, cf. AIW 1425; New Persian has barzan); it was frequently confused (cf. also Dhabhar 1949, Glossary, 168) with gāl, gālān, according to Nyberg 1974, 80, "the gang, the villains labouring on the estates of the king", Old Persian garda², "servant, worker" (Elamite kur-taš, Aramaic grd[ā]), Babylonian Lu-gar-du, Old Indic grhā "servant", Khotanese ggald "family", -> Pahlavi gāl (only Plural), "attendants, followers, household". Cf. KNA P 10.8 (Tafazzoli 1990, 51-2): gālān ī Kirm hāmōyēn xēr ud xVāstāg ud bunag ō drubuštīh ī dīz ī *Gulārān nīhād, "the attendants of the Dragon deposited all their property, wealth and baggage in the citadel of the fortress Gulārān". gāl² (Nyberg 1974, 80) in Aydgār ī Zarerān 25, should be read dār "blade" (Tafazzoli 1990, 51).

77 Probably, an old emendation for the original *dūdāg, "household". The reading is problematic: Dhabhar 1949, Glossary, 154, 197: *dōwāg, "messenger, etc."; dōwāg, in PY 32.13, this word translates mānērānō dūtīm; AIW 749 supposed *gōwāg; the gloss rāyēnīdār supports the meaning like that suggested by Bartholomae and Dhabhar, rather than the original *dūdāg, "household". It is not impossible that lābag in Dk 9.32.1 is a distortion of the same word here.

That [the life] asked (to be) His own, that of the community (together) with that of the clan [this reward of Ohrmazd Himself, the demons, in these (words): "we are Thy community/ adherent(s) and clan/friend(s)"; so they asked]

his demons in my mind [i.e., our thinking is as righteous as that (of) Zoroaster] this joy of Ohrmazd [so they asked]

We are thy speakers [i.e., we are Thy arrangers], we hold (back)⁷⁸ those who hurt Thee [i.e., we hold them back of Thee].

The Avestan text of Y 32.1 was translated in the Pahlavi version mostly etymologically, word by word; it seems, nevertheless, that the text remained obscure, perhaps, on purpose. *Dēws*, meaning here, perhaps, "gods", not "demons" (compare the translations by Insler and Schwartz), is clearly Vocative. In Y 32.1a, *axīlācā* was analyzed by the glossator differently from *ahīlā*, for reasons rather graphical than textual (*ā* looks very much as *x^v*, so the glossator of [gyān⁷⁹] confused it with *x^v*), the grammatical cases of *x^vaētuš ... varəzānəm mat arilamnā* were misunderstood (*hān ī awē pad x^vaētuš ... hān ī awē wālanīh abāg ərmanīh*), but the general sense of 32.1a and 32.1c was grasped; the problem is, however, with Y 32.1b. One point of importance is that *ahīlā daēuua mahmt manōi* (the *daēva*-adherents - on my terms; at my insistence, ye gods; in my recital, O you *Daēvas*; o false gods, at my inspiration) was rendered as *hān ī awē dēwān pad man menīšnīh*, "his demons by my thought", which seems to be, by the *Zandists'* standards, a rather faithful translation. It is not impossible that *hān mēnōg hēm* in 9.32.2 is an echo of this *Zand*.

Compare Dk 9.32.2: *awēšān dēwān az zufrāy ō burz lābag ēwāzīhā ax^vard xayūg xēwag kū x^vaēšīh ī adrujīšn ud ēwagəz kū wālanīh ī adrujīšn ēwag kū ərmanīh ī adrujīšn hādəm guft pad ēn kū: "hān mēnōg hēm ka x^vaēš ərman ud wālan ēwag abāg did mihr nē drōzēnd ..., etc.*

This version should be compared with that of Dk 9.9.180:

haštom fragard X^vadamēd abar pahrēz ī az ēzišn ī Gannāg Mēnōg rāy anastōwān ī Dēn ud hān ī az ēzišn ī Indr ud ō Sawar rāy an.ēbyānghān.dād ud hān ī az ēzišn ī Tawric ud Zairic rāy ēw.mōg.dwārišn, ud hān az ēzišn ī Akataš rāy duš nigerāygar, ud hān az ēzišn ī hamāg dēwān rāy amār.gan.dād mardom ud šnāyēnīdan mādagwar,

The eighth *fragard*, *X^vadamēd*, (is) about the avoidance (care/abstinence⁸¹) and special propitiation of people of non-reliance on the Avesta, because of (being involved in) the worship of the Stinking Spirit (*namely*) because of (practices like) the worship of Indr, and of *Sāwar*, practicing being ungirdled with the sacred *kūstīg*-girdle; because of the worship of *Tawric* ud *Zairic*⁸², (*daevically*) walking around with one shoe; and because of the worship of *Akataš*, who (the demon *Akataš* is the) producer of bad observance; and because of the worship of all the demons, practicing being without the serpents-killing-mace.

78 The infinitive *dāraīfō*, "to push back, zurückzuhalten", rendered well by sense, especially in the gloss, but grammatically wrong.

79 An interesting gloss, no doubt, of some age; there are more examples for rendering *axīlācā* by *gyān*, cf. Dhabhar 1949, Glossary, 140. Cf. also Dk 9.32.3: *frāz frēbēd mardom [ī] gētīg pad huztawanišn ud a.marg.rawišnīh*, "You deceive the worldly people as to good *life* and propagation of *immortality*".

80 Dk 9.9: DkM 792.17-794.4; DkS XVII, 13-16; DkD *missing folios* 147.7-150.1; West 1892, 181-185.

81 In a similar double sense the verb is used in Mānī's *Sāhbuhragān* 131 (MacKenzie 1979, 508-9): *[?jwd k² xrdyšhr yz[d] ?w šhr phryz²d*, "and when god *Xradsēahr* will *care for* the world...".

82 On *Tereš* (*Taric*) in Esther, and Haman's wife, *Zereš* (*Zaric*), cf. Shaked 1985, 518; cf. also Duchesne-Guillemine 1953.

Like in other cases (e.g., Dk 9.6 as compared to Dk 9.29), it is the Waršt mānsr version, rather than that of the S[t]ūdgār Nask, that preserves the older material, while that of the S[t]ūdgār Nask underwent serious censorship, exactly because being originally of mythological character, was entitled to be more popular.

We do not know who are these three demons or what their names are [cf. APPENDIX III Hārūt wa Mārūt]; they represent themselves as *ēwag kū xV-ēših ī adrūjīšn ud ēwagēz kū wālanth ī adrūjīšn ēwag kū ērmānth ī adrūjīšn, "one that he is the family that is undeceitful, another one that he is the community that is undeceitful, and of the third one that he is the clan that is undeceitful".

It is tempting to find under the terms xV-ēših, wālanth, ērmānth another, older stratum, such as the (partly synonymous) sequence *mān, *wis, *zand. Indeed, the sequence is found further in this fragard (Dk 9.32.23)⁸³. I believe that the terms in question are connected to the terms found in Mānī's Sāhbuhragān, who, in my opinion, used while composing this work, Zoroastrian *Zands* similar (if not close till identical) to X^vadamēd fragard and *Proto-Bundahīšn. In Mānī's Sāhbuhragān (cf. Sundermann 1979a, 777), Spiritus Vivens (*rūhā hayyā) was called Mihryazd, while in all other languages used by the Manichaean tradition, the name was simply translated. His five sons are called in the Sāhbuhragān: mānbed, "head of the house" (Atlas, Sbl²); wisbed, "the head of the clan" (Adamas of Light, d'mws nwhr²); zandbed, "the head of the clan" (King of Glory, mlk² šwbh²); dahybed, "the head of the country" (the Keeper of Splendor, spt zyw²); pahragbed, "the head of the frontier post" (the King of Honor, mlk² rb² d'yqr²), cf. Sundermann 1979a, 780. Sundermann argued convincingly for the Middle Persian names being derived from a *zand* to Yt 19.18 or Yt 10.115 (Sundermann 1979a, 784-5), with a single deviation; the Zoroastrian

83 ēg hān xVadāyih bē barānd kē pādixšāy hēnd kay ud karapan hānaz ī dušxVadāyiom kē pad deh abar ō awē ī huxVadāyiom andar mān ud wis ud zand ud deh. ēg har dō wāng barānd kē hān ī huxVadāy ud hānaz kē hān [ī] dušxVadāy ud zānthēd hān ī dušxVadāy ud ō awē ī huxVadāyiom xVadāyih bē abespārthēd, "Then they will remove this rule, whose sovereigns are the *kays* and the *karapans*, these the very worst rulers who are in the land, unto whom who is the best ruler in the house, in the clan, in the tribe and in the country. Then both will raise their voices, this who is the best ruler and even this who is the worst ruler, and the worst ruler will be smitten, and the rule will be transferred to him who is the best ruler".

clerical dignity of zardu(x)štrōtom was replaced by pahragbed, "the head of the frontier post". Moreover, Sundermann 1979a, 786, has observed that in the Sāhbuhragān the order of the five sons of Mihryazd corresponds to the order of the *ratus* found in Zoroastrian texts (as in the case of Dk 9.32.23 and, according to my identification, also in Dk 9.32.2), while in other Manichaean texts the order is different. To these should be compared another Zoroastrian text, though a much later one, namely GrBd 29.1: gōwēd pad Dēn kū: hān šaš radth [ī kišwarān], har ēwag ēw rad ēw hast, "He says in the Avesta: "those six"⁸⁴ (spiritual) *rad*-ships" [of the continents]⁸⁵; (it means that) each (continent) has a (spiritual) *rad*-. There are two ways to explain the deviation in Dk 9.32.2 from the normal rendering (*mān, *wis, *zand > xV-ēših, wālanth, ērmānth): 1) another, peculiar, probably, local tradition of *Zandists*; 2) secondary and conscious substitution of the older *mān, *wis, *zand by the newer xV-ēših, wālanth, ērmānth, when the older sequence became tarred with Manichaean connotations.

I find an allusion to (Manichaean?) unauthorized distortion of Zoroastrian *Zands* in Dk 9.32.20, where heretics are blamed for their reliance on the Avesta and Zand, but having actually robbed them:

awēšānaz gōwēnd kē ēd ī tō Dēn ī Mazdēsnañ ōšmurēnd. awēšān Zardu(x)št az tō hānaz ī rāyīšn ud windīšn ēd kū apparēnd ud tar ēd ī tō yazīšn menēnd ud tar niyāyīšn. ud tar hān ī har dō wābarīgānthā menēnd Abistāg ud Zand kē ō tō man frāz guft kē mēnōgān abzōnīgdom hom,

"These, too, say that they recite this Mazda-worshipping Religion of thine (O Zoroaster!).

⁸⁶They, O Zoroaster!, rob from thee that which is to be arranged and found, and⁸⁷ they scorn thy ritual and cult. They scorn these two truthworthinesses, the Avesta and Zand, which I have spoken out to thee, I, who am the most bountiful of all the mēnōg beings!"

84 As Sundermann 1979a, 780, has observed, sometimes the Manichaean pentad of Mihryazd's sons is accompanied by the sixth member, whom he identified with the god Cali (Xruštag/X^vandag).

85 It should be noted in passing that the Zoroastrian seven continents may have influenced, at least partly, the Manichaean idea of eight Earths.

86 Molé 1967, 209: "ils importeront même ce qui vient de ton héritage [rēxn]". The translation of West 1892, 258, differs considerably; the word read as rēxn by Molé and rāyīšn by me, was apparently read "rēšēnēnd" ("those whom they hurt") by West.

87 Molé 1963, 228: "et ils s'opposent à tes sacrifices et à ta prière, et ils s'opposent aux deux prescriptions, l'Avesta et le Zand, que je t'ai dites, moi le plus saint des esprits"; Molé 1967, 209: "ils mépriseront tes sacrifices et ton culte, mépriseront les deux documents, l'Avesta et le Zand, que je t'ai donnés, moi le plus saint des esprits".

One finds a reference to Mānī inserted in Dk 9.39.13, this particular chapter, namely Dk 9.39, being, supposedly, an abbreviation of the Warštmanšār version of Y 46. The chapter has little in common with the Pahlavi version of the Yasna in question; it begins: 16-om fragard kāmnmēz. abar franāftan ī ō kadāraz ē būm pad nōg xʷāhišnīh ī xʷarrah, "The 16th fragard kāmnmēz. About departure to any land whatever, in the new search after xʷarrah". It is worth noting how different is the wording in the extant PY 46.1a: ō kadār zamīg ānāmōm (sic!), "to which land should I bend?". The reference to Mānī (Dk 9.39.13) is as follows: abar nišān ī druz ī xastag ī Mānī ud druwandān īš niyōxšāg zanišn īš az awē ī dahyped mad, "about the mark of the smiting of the *druz*-demon, the crippled Man and his *auditors*, which (smiting) came from the lord of the country⁸⁸". There is nothing in the Pahlavi version of the Yasna that would support this mentioning of Mānī; I believe it was rather the context, with a series of "trigger-words", namely, xʷad, ērman, ham ham.haxag (Dk 9.39.1)⁸⁹, felt as having something to do with Mānī, that has provoked this insertion.

In the latter Zoroastrian tradition, Mānī was seen as the zandīg, "zand-maker", *par excellence*. He was set together with the worst enemies of the Good Religion, cf., e.g., Dk 5.3.3 (DkM 437.9ff.); West 1897, 126-7; Bailey 1943, 217, 154; Molé 1967, 110-113:

nāmcištīg cišān ī andar zamānagīhā pas mad ud rasīd ī azēš wizand.kārān ciyōn Alaksandar ī Ayrēraθ zadār Mahrkūs ud Dahāg ud abārtīg zand.kārān wirōyīšn.wālānēz Mašīh ud Mānī ud abārtīg āwāmīhā ciyōn pōlāwdēn ud āhan abar *xāk gumēxt abārtīg dēn ārāstārān winārdārān āwurdārān ciyōn Ardaxšēr Ādurbed Xusraw ud Pēšyōtan Hōšēdar Hōšēdarmāh Sōšyans abārtīgān,

88 de Menasce 1945, 240 (F): "allusion à l'exécution du maudit Mānī et de ses pervers auditeurs, qui a été l'œuvre de ce souverain"; also in Jackson, *Modi Memorial Volume*, 34-6 (*non vidi*).

89 Which sends the reader back to Dk 9.32.1-3.

"namely, matters to come in the later times, producers of harm, such as Alexander the smiter of Ayrēraθ, Mahrkūs⁹⁰ and Dahāg and other makers of *Zands*, such as Jesus and Mānī, and also other epochs, such as that of steel and iron mixed with earth, other restorers, organizers and introducers of the religion, such as Ardaxšēr, Ādurbād, Xusraw, Pēšyōtan, Hōšēdar, Hōšēdarmāh, Sōšyans, (and) others".

His teachings were known to Zoroastrian polemicists centuries after his death: Dk 3.200.4(3) (Olsson 1991, 277, 282): ēwag padirag hān ī ahlāyīh ārāstār Ādurbād weh mehmān padTriftan handarzēnīd, druz xastag Mānī māraz hānēš mehmān andar padTrīšn bawēd āšyānēš dawīst, "contrary to that which the restorer of righteousness, Ādurbād, declared, namely, to receive the good as guests, the crippled demon Mānī clamoured that even his *house*⁹¹ was for the reception of those guest of his, i.e., his nest", which is paralleled by Dk 3.200.12(11) (cf. Olsson 1991, 281, 283):

ēwag padirag hān ī ahlāyīh ārāstār Ādurbād yazdān pad tan mehmān kardan handarzēnīd, druz ī xastag ī Mānī yazdān pad tan mehmān nē bawēd bē andar tanbastag hast dawīst,

"contrary to that which the restorer of righteousness, Ādurbād, declared, namely, to make the gods guests in the body, the crippled demon Mānī clamoured that the gods were not the guests in the body, but are fettered in the body".

One point of the Manichaean lore seemed to be especially provoking to catch the eye of the Zoroastrian compiler of SGW (SGW 16.51-2, cf. Jackson 1932, 180-1; de Menasce 1945, 254-5):

90 Avestan Mahrkūsā-, the evil winter, later became the name of the flood rain Malkōš, no doubt (cf. West 1897, 108 n. 1) being identified with the Hebrew malqōš, "autumnal rain", cf. Dk 7.9.3. The Hebrew word is a frequent one, as it appears in the Jewish prayer read thrice a day.

91 An obvious play on words in an attempt to etymologize Mānī's name; cf. Shapira 1999.

did ēn kū hān dō *bunyaštān⁹² hamāgihā ēstīšnīh ham.wimandihā abāg būd
ciyōn āftāb ud sāyag ūšān nē būd hēc *niyām⁹³ ud wišādagih miyān,

"Again, (the Manichæans say that) these two "original creations/principles" exist contiguously having common border⁹⁴, just as sunshine and shadow, and they have no interval or void in between".

We cannot know whether an actual Manichæan text was quoted or what we have here is a piece of oral lore; we cannot know whether this idea goes back to Mānī himself, but it seems to be an old notion, because many old authors, like Ephrem and Augustine, refer to it. On the other hand, it is impossible to tell, whether the Zoroastrian notion, which was just the opposite of the Manichæan one, was there in existence in Mānī's times, or it was coined as an antithesis to the belief held by Manichæans.

For this Manichæan notion, Bd 1.2-10 [APPENDIX IV TEXT I] could serve as the background, though no textual correspondence is suggested here.

The terminology of Mānī's Šāhbuhragān is less "Semitic" than the terminology of any other Manichæan Iranian group of texts; Jesus, so prominent in any other Manichæan tradition, including those of the cultures almost not touched by the Christian impact, appears in a heavily Zoroastrianized disguise. This is natural, as Mānī composed this book for the King of Kings, as its name indicates, in the King's language, aiming at propagating his own religion in Eranšahr, rather than for use of the already existing Manichæan community (cf. Sundermann 1979b, 106). I think in the conditions in which Mānī's Šāhbuhragān was written one may see the clue for the explanation of several enigmas connected with the character of Manichæism as such: this religion appeared as, basically, a Judæo-Christian Mesopotamian Aramaic sect, but it was the attempt to convert the King of Kings that gave this religion its Iranian flavor. Mānī was urged to present his religion in the form of a *Zand* (and, I believe, he made use of some existing *Zands* while composing his Šāhbuhragān), in order to pass as a Zoroastrian.

92 Or, *bundahīšnān?

93 The text: nīšām.

But doing that, he had no choice but to make some theological concessions; having performed this first step, he was led, by the natural inner logic of the texts he himself has composed, to move in the "Iranian" direction. Of course, this assumption does not explain everything Iranian in Manichæism; numerous Iranian traits were already found in Judaism and Gnostic Christianity as Mānī inherited some of them, due partly to direct Iranian impact of many centuries on the one hand, and to some basic structural parallels between Judaism and Zoroastrianism, on another.

Sundermann 1979b, 108-9 *et passim* explained the discrepancy between the Middle Persian and Middle Parthian Manichæan terminologies, an old problem in Manichæan studies, by the assumption that Mār Ammō, Mānī's missionary to Parthians, had taken the religious terminology of his teacher in its earlier form, as it was prior to Mānī's composition of his Šāhbuhragān. This explanation enables us to resolve many problems and makes possible to date several episodes in the early Manichæan history more accurately. But it also entitles us to suggest that Mānī's Šāhbuhragān was, actually, a sort of revolutionary development in Mānī's religious thought.

On the following pages I will deal with the *textual history* of some important Zoroastrian notions connected with Fire personified and with cosmogonical matters as far as Fire is concerned. I am not interested here with the developments of the Zoroastrian attitudes towards Fire as such, or with Fire worship, only with some *Zands* referring to Fire. It may be taken for granted that the Iranians before Zoroaster certainly knew some form of Fire worship, as many other peoples did, and Zoroaster himself referred several times elsewhere to Fire in his *Gāθās*.

Yasna Haptaŋhāiti, "the Yasna of Seven Chapters" (Y 35-41; these are short prayers addressed to the *yazatas*), though a part of the *Gāθās*, is not, nevertheless, generally regarded by the majority of Western scholars to be Zoroaster's *ipsissima verba*. One of these *Yasnas*, Y 36, was addressed to Fire, and these are the textual ramifications of this Yasna that will be analyzed here.

Y 36 (for the Avestan text and its English rendering by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994: [TEXT I]) was misunderstood by the *Zandist(s)* on some crucial points (while grasping accurately the sense of the others), thus conceiving new ideas, later reflected in subsequent *Zands*.

Already PY 36.1 [TEXT II] introduces the stress on "action", *warzišn*, glossed as "care and propitiation / *Gāθās*", being a misunderstanding of the Avestan texts. This stress on "action", *kunišn*, is obvious in Dk 9 passages derived from PY 36 (where echoes of PY 36.4, and not only the wrongly interpreted PY 36.1, played a rôle). PY 36.2 (and PY 30.2c) presents us with "greater work through the constitution which is of/in the Body to Come", *yāh-* being generally rendered both *passāxt* and *kār*, which were quoted in two slightly different versions in Dk 9.35.12 [TEXT III] and in Dk 9.57.15 [TEXT IV], and with a personalization of *urwāhmīh*, Joy, derived from Avestan *uruuāz-* (Y 36.2), cf. Dk 9.35.11 [TEXT III]; 9.57.13 [TEXT IV]. The same PY 36.2 took a stand of reciprocity, perhaps having been influenced by PY 36.5, clear echoes of which could be heard in Dk 9.35.13; 9.57.13, 15-16 (Dk 9.57.15, which uses the verb *zōrēnīdan*, "to invigorate", seems to represent better the original understanding of Avestan *išūdiia mahī*, than PY 36.5 with its *ābāmēnīdan*). PY 36.2 clearly misunderstood the indeed difficult Avestan *huuō naā yātaīia*, which it rendered as *ō awē mard pad tuwān*.

Unlike many proper *Gāθic* passages which were analyzed in their Pahlavi version while dividing the text into small units, with the fuller context frequently remaining obscure, the texts of Yasna Haptaŋhāiti were comprehended by *Zandists*, on the contrary, as an inter-referring unity. Beside the already mentioned, though trivial, example of "action", PY 36.3 contains a gloss "I will take away from it (the Fire) the spiritual and corporeal dung" which can hardly be motivated by the Avestan text. It should be an echo of *ēnīgīh*, "pollution", rhyming (in the glosses) with the more frequently found *anāgīh*:

kē ō awē ēnīgīh [kū pad āta(x)š anāgīh kunēd] *hānāz ō awē ēnīgīh dahēd* [kū hānāz pad awē anāgīh kunēd],

"one to whom (there is) pollution [who badly afflicts the Fire], even to him He gives pollution [i.e., He badly afflicts him, too]",

which translates

yā ā axtīš ahmāi yām axtōiīōi dāghē,

"you who are pain to the one whom you seize for painful treatment" (Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 55) /

"You who are taboo (=off limits) for him whom You have established as being taboo" (Schwartz 1985a, 493).

There Avestan *axtay-*, "Schmerz" (AiW; Schwartz: "taboo") was rendered by the Pahlavi version as *ēnīgīh*, "pollution"¹; in other cases this word was glossed, besides *anāgīh*, "evil", also as *waštagīh*, "sick", *dard*, "pain", and *bēmārt* (*ibid.*) in a New Persian version.

It is this translation, namely *ēnīgīh*, that enables us to state that PY 36 was one of the sources of the glosses of Smaller *STRōzag* 9 (which is practically identical with *Ataš Niyāyīšn* 5-7) [TEXT V]. There are two problematic words in these two mostly identical texts written in a slightly different way. The Pahlavi text reads there:

*ud bēšāzēnīdārīh mēnōgīhā zadārīh *āhō[g]ān.*gardān az Spennā[g].Mēnōg dāmān,*

"his healing is (his) smiting (of demons) *mēnōgically* and ...? ...? from the creatures of the Bountiful Spirit".

¹ For the semantics of Avestan *axtay-*, cf. the Armenian loan word *axt*, "pain; defect; blemish".

The problematic, and, no doubt, corrupt, words *āhō[g]ān.*gardān were explained by Dhabhar 1963, 320 (cf. also nn. 12-13) as "averting {gartān} infection {*āhōkīnišn} (from the creatures of Spenāk Mīnō)". Dehdašti 1363 h.s. (1985), 50-1 (cf. also nn. 4-5) read them as axvišn dārtān, translating "to carry away the material pain (from the creatures of the Bountiful Spirit)" (az bīn burdan-i dardhā-i māddt [az dāmān-i Sepīnā Mīnō]).

The first problematic word in the version of Ataš Niyāyišn 5 is written slightly differently; Dhabhar 1963, 69 (cf. also nn. 10-11) translated "averting pollution". He quoted both the (Zoroastrian) New Persian version (bīmarg gardān) and Dhalla's reading and translation (unavailable to me) apparently based on it: ahūšn, "rendering unconscious".

In my opinion, the first corrupt word goes back to PY 36.1, ānīgīh, "pollution", which translates axtay-, "Schmerz", glossed anāgīh, waštagīh, dard; the New Persian version of PY 36.1, bēmārī, "sickness", is of interest, when compared with the also corrupt New Persian version of Ataš Niyāyišn, namely, bīmarg, "immortal"².

This example demonstrates that Pahlavi versions of the Gāθā were used for drawing upon glosses into other Pahlavi versions of other Avestan texts. To the rendering of Avestan uruuāzištō and uruuāz<a>liā of Y 36.2 as urwāhmīh we will return later.

The most important misunderstanding of the Avestan original occurs in PY 36.3: the Avestan sequence tōi nāmanam vāzišm ātarə mazdā ahurahiā was rendered as awē ī tō nām cīyōn wāzišt ō āta(x)š ī ōhrmazd, resulting in the creation of a Fire of ōhrmazd, whose name is wāzišt. The emphasis on the name(s) of ōhrmazd /His Fire(s) found in Dk 9.57.15 [TEXT IV], resulting in an error in understanding in Y 36.3, does not go back to the extant form of PY 36.3. The error is reflected also in the Pahlavi version: "to this name of thee, which is wāzišt, to the Fire of ōhrmazd". In the latter Zoroastrian tradition in Pahlavi this is the name of a Fire, namely that of lighting.

2 As to the second word, one has to read it perhaps not *gardān, but *dardān, "pains", and to identify it with the glosses dard in the Plural.

This misunderstanding was of utmost importance, because once it was made, another Fires were looked for, and, indeed, found: one of them, in the same Y 36.3, another in Y 36.2. Both Fires newly found in the Gāθic passage became prominent in Late Sasanian metaphysics, but while their ultimate source was Y 36, it was not (I will stress again) Y 36 in its extant Pahlavi version!

The names of these two newly-born Fires are Urwāzišt, the Fire residing in trees, and Speništ, the Fire produced by friction. To the Fire Speništ / abzōnīg belong the fires known in our world, and the Sacred Fires of Zoroastrian Iran were of that type, while Speništ and āta(x)š ī Warhrān were identified, to some degree, cf. Bd 18.6 [TEXT VI] and WZs 3.78³ [TEXT VII] (the gloss mentioned the Fire Warhrān in PY 36.3 is taken from a secondary source, most probably, from PY 17.11 [TEXT VIII]). Their names, as in the case of wāzišt, are just "learned" Avesticisms, Avestan names adapted to Middle Persian pronunciation, with no meaning in Pahlavi.

However, the Pahlavi version of Y 36 does not have these names! It translated uruuāzištō, the source of Urwāzišt, by urwāhmīh, "joy", and spēništō, the source of Speništ, by abzōnīg.

In other words, while wāzišt could have been taken into the later Zoroastrian literature from PY 36 in its present form, Urwāzišt and Speništ could not.

So far, we met three "arch-" Fires, but the Zoroastrian tradition knew 5 (or, 6) "metaphysical" types of Fire, only one of them being the fire known to us ("in the world"), namely the above-mentioned Fire of the Speništ (or, abzōnīg) type, "produced by friction" / "which is in the stones".

The information about these Fires comes mostly from Bd 18 [TEXT VI] and WZs 3.78-86 [TEXT VII]. These "arch"-Fires include (the forms of their names are given as in Bd 18):
Barəzi Sawang, shining in the spiritual world; invisible
Wohu-Frīdān, in the body of man and animals
Urwāzišt, in trees

3 But compare WZs 3.82, where it was the Fire buland.sūd, whose x^varrah is inhabitant in the Fire Warhrān. The reason for that change will be explained further.

Wazīšt, the fire of lightning

Spenīšt, fire produced by friction

Neryōsang, the fire in the body of kings and great ones.

It is not entirely clear what was the scriptural source for such a tradition; it cannot be PY 36 in its present form, as only one name is found in it, and two others could be supposed to exist in a Pahlavi version of Y 36 which we do not possess now. However, all the six Fires appear in Y 17.11 [TEXT VIII], a secondary Avestan text, and one should suppose that this text was drawn upon several Avestan texts, in all probability, from Avestan commentaries to Avestan texts, only one of them being Y 36.

However, PY 17.11 cannot, in its turn, be the source of the list of the Fires in Bd 18, as the names used in the Bd version are "learned" Avesticisms⁴, while the extant Pahlavi version of PY 17.11, where the Fires are named and glossed, used only Pahlavi translations of their names, not the Avestan forms, as in other sources.

Here Bərəzī Sava[ḡ]h/Bīrz Sawang is glossed buland.sūd, "of lofty profit", identified with the Fire of Wahrām/Wahrān; Wohu-Frīān, glossed weh.franāftār, "the good propagator/confessor"; Urwāzišt, glossed over frāxv.zīwišn, both of these analyzed by closeness of sound (cf. also Bd 18.3-4, weh.franāftār/Wohu-Frīān, andar urwārān/Urwāzišt); Wazīšt, unglossed (but in Bd 18.5 it is said Wāzišt hān ī andar abr, "is that which is in the cloud[s]"; clouds do move, *wazēnd, the verb used also in Bd 18.13); Spenīšt was glossed regularly abzōnīg.

However, the sixth Fire, Ata[x]š Neryōsang, that of the kings' race, apparently, identifiable to some degree with the royal xVarrah, does not appear in all the sources, and it was left unglossed in PY 17.11. The order of the Fires is also sometimes different: thus, the order given above is based on in PY 17.11, which corresponds to the latter order given in the [New] Persian Rivāyats. Shapur Bharuchi gives a New Persian list of fires (cf. Dhahhar 1932, 59) as follows:

"The first fire is Barzīšavang which is before Ohrmazd.

The second fire is Vohu-Fryān which is in the bodies of men and animals. The third fire is Orvājīst which is in plants.

⁴ But note the Pahlavi glosses to the Avestan names of the Fires in Bd 18, which correspond to PY 17.11.

The fourth fire is Vājīst which appears from lightning and fight with Spēzarašk demon.

The fifth fire is Spenīšt which is manifest in the world and is in the stones.

The sixth fire is Neryōsang which resides in the navel of the kings⁵.

Two important lists provided in Bd 18 and in WZs 3 have a common feature: they omit the last, sixth, Neryōsang Fire, that of the kings. However, despite this omission, both lists disagree on the order of the first and the last (the fifth, in their sequence) Fire. The order of Bd 18.1ff. is the same as in PY 17.11 and the Rivāyat, with Ata[x]š ī Bərəzī Sawang / (āta[x]š ī) buland.sūd on the first place and with Ata[x]š ī Spenīšt / (āta[x]š ī) abzōnīg on the last, fifth, place, while WZs 3.78-82 put (āta[x]š ī) abzōnīg on the first place and (āta[x]š ī) buland.sūd on the last, fifth, place. The order given in WZs is secondary as compared with other lists, especially with that of Bd 18, for in WZs 3.82 the Fire buland.sūd moved to the last place, retained the Warhrānian nature of the last Fire, which originally was Spenīšt.

Besides, WZs 3 used Pahlavized names (for three of the five Fires) as given in PY 17.11 (though the number and the order are slightly different), while Bd 18 and the Rivāyat used the "learned" Avestan forms. Thus, there were four groups of texts on Fires:

six Fires	five Fires	"learned" Avestan	Pahlavized
PY 17	Bd 18	Bd 18	PY 17
Rivāyat	WZs 3	Rivāyat	WZs 3.

In WZs 3.82 we can still see why the sixth Fire was dropped: the Fire buland.sūd (*Bərəzī Sawang), "whose profit is lofty" and whose xVarrah dwells in the Fire Warhrān, was clearly seen as being of lordly nature, and this is why the royal functions of the Fire Neryōsang were absorbed into it. It is stated of the Fire buland.sūd in the same WZs 3.82 that his dwelling (mehmānīh) in the Fire Warhrān is like that of "the master of a house on (his own) house" (ciyōn kadag.xVadāy abar xānag); this is another Pahlavi translation of the passage on the Fire Neryōsang in Y 17.11, but derived from a translation different from the extant PY 17.11 (which has the corrupt mān mānbed, cf. also Dk 9.12.4). This absorption of the Fire Neryōsang into the Fire buland.sūd (*Bərəzī Sawang) was, consequently, the reason why *Bərəzī Sawang was removed in WZs 3 from the first place to the last, that of the

Fire Neryōsang. It seems that WZs 3.78.86 was based on texts very close to, but not identical with those of the sources of Bd 18. The source(s?) of the WZs version was, as a rule, smoother than those of Bd 18, as can be seen, e.g., in the treatment of the order of the Fires and in the *midrashic* story told in WZs 3.86 and in Bd 18.9. Here it should be added that *midrashic* elements seem to have been serving also in sources of Dk 9.12 [TEXT IX] and 9.35 [TEXT III], as Dk 9.12.5; 9.35.13 use quotations from some extinct Avestan sources of legendary character.

PY 36.6, especially its second half, departs considerably from its Avestan original, partly because of the wrong grammatical analysis of the text: it was not realized that *īmā raocā* stands in Plural, moreover, these two words were divided, with *raocā* taken as Dative, not Accusative. Besides, Accusative Singular *barəzištəm* was understood as an *izāfe* to *raocā*, resulting in *ēn ō hān ī rōšnīh*, with *ēn* (for Avestan Plural *īmā*) glossed over as *ruwān*, "soul". The words *īmā raocā* were taken in the scholarly literature as referring the Sacred Fires, while Gershevitch 1959, 293, explained them as "daylight". We must give more credit to Gershevitch's view on the meaning of the words also in the Avestan text for the simple reason that in the Yasna dedicated to Fires, *īmā raocā* was not understood as referring to Fires by the Pahlavi version. This is also true because of the usage of *kahrp-/karb*, "body-form": the Pahlavi version makes it clear that these are rather celestial bodies than "form of fire".

Passages like Bd 1.44⁵ may indeed go back to lost *Zands* to the *Gāθā* in question ("from his own selfness", *az hān ī xVēš xVadīh*, in Bd 1.44 reflects perhaps the misunderstood *hīat* of Y 36.3, rendered as *xVad* in the extant PY 36.3), but not to a text we have here now.

The problematic (cf. Humbach 1991, II, 123) *barəzamanam* of Y 36.6 was translated by a verb in 3rd Pl., "they elevate", *bālənānd*, coming up with "this [soul] they elevate to this the most high light [(high even) from what is open to the eye] there, which is called Sun". The result sounds rather "Manichæan": here *karb* and [*ruwān*] stand in a parallelism: "Good is this body-form (karb) of Thee ... [I proclaim thus in the world(s) that this body-form of Thee is the

5 Ohrmazd az hān ī xVēš xVadīh [gēlig rōšnīh] ud az gēlig rōšnīh karb ī dāmān ī xVēš frāz brēnēnd ī pad atā[x]š.karb ī rōšn ī spēd ī gīrd frāz paydāg, "Ohrmazd fashioned forth from his own selfness [material light], from material light He fashioned forth the shape of his creatures which was manifest in the shape of fire, bright, white, round" (tr: Shaked 1967, 232).

best]; this [soul] (*ruwān*) they elevate to this the most high light ...", recalling Manichæan absorption of accumulated⁶ Light in *grīw⁷ and transmitting it to the Moon and Sun (cf. PY 36.6: *rōšnīh ī bālist ... xVāršēd*). That such interpretation of the PY 36.6 is correct can be seen from its echo in Bd 18.15, which thus must go back to a *Zand* of PY 36.6: after one's death, "the body mingles with the earth and the soul goes back to the *mēnōg*" (compare also the non-motivated stress on the "Body to Come" in PY 36.2; Dk 9.35.12; Dk 9.57.15)⁸. One may (and should) elevate his own soul (cf. the gloss to PY 36.6) to the station of the Sun, cf. Dk 9.57.18. This could be achieved by means of learning and teaching, wherefrom good deeds and other spiritual boons occur (Dk 9.57.13, 16, derived from a wrong analysis of *cištōiš* of Y 36.4 and from Y 36.5, both unsupported by the extant PY 36).

It seems that the Manichæan "Light" took place of the Zoroastrian "Fire". There is an indication that Zoroastrian *Zands* close to these studied here were existing about Mānī's time⁹. In the Zoroastrian lore, the Fire *Wāzišt* resides in Cloud (*abr*), cf. Bd 18.5, WZs3.81. In latter Zoroastrian *Zands*, Cloud became so closely associated with Fire (of the *Wāzišt* type) and Wind, whose function is to fight back the Assault, that Cloud (*abr*) became desintegrated from the Fire *Wāzišt*, was turned into an independent entity and the Fire *Wāzišt*, *Wād* (Wind) and *Abr* (Cloud) were seen as three elements, cf. Bd 2.15:

ud miyān ī nēm.spihr gumārd Wād ud Abr ud Atā[x]š ī Wāzišt, kū ka Ebged rased, pad hān ī Ab mēnōg hān ī Tištr āb stānēd ud wārān wārēnēd, ūš bandəz awēšān ham ō xVāršēd ud Māh ud stāragān kard, ūš did¹⁰ tištr ī xVārāsān spāhbed, hamkār ud hamāyār ī Atā[x]š ī Wāzišt ud Wād ud Abr,

6 Compare the gloss to PY 36.3: "[I will take away from it (the Fire) the spiritual and corporeal dung]", which clearly refers to refinement of Fire "in These Both" (*ibid.*), i.e., in the *mēnōg* and *gēlig* aspects.

7 Cf. Shapira 1999.

8 Cf. Dk 9.30.1: *mēnōg ī ēzišn ī awē humēnīdār ī āgāh ī dānāg mard tēz abar gumēxtēd ō hān ī xVāršēd rōšnīh ō kāmāg hanjāmīh ud urwāhm ī Amanraspandān paywandēd*, "the *mēnōg* of the worship (performed) by a good-thinking, intelligent, wise man is quickly mixed up with the light of the sun and attached to the completion of desire(s) and joy(s) of the Bountiful Immortal Ones".

9 Cf. Mānī and *Zand*.

10 Anklesaria 1956, 34-5: tag, "valiant".

"And among the hemisphere"¹¹ He appointed Wād (Wind), Abr (Cloud) and Ata(x)š (the [lightning-]Fire) wāzišt, so that when the Assault arrives, Tištr could take water(s), through the Water-"spirit"¹², and cause the rain (to fall). He also tied them together to the Sun, the Moon and the stars, and again, Tištr the Chieftain of the East, is the assistant and helper of the Fire wāzišt, Wād (Wind) and Abr (Cloud)".

It seems that the traditions about Five Fires (not six) and that close to reflected in Bd 2.15 were exploited twice in Manichaean writings:

1) Mānī utilized a tradition similar to that of Bd 2.15 while identifying the First Son of the First Man as "air/ether". This should be a reflection of the Pahlavi abr; we cannot state whether Mānī rendered abr as "air/ether" intentionally or perhaps he interpreted erroneously the Pahlavi word, because for him, it sounded similar to the Greek ἀήρ (cf. Kurdish for "cloud", e'wr, hewir)¹³.

2) Five Manichaean elements (Middle Persian: Mahrspandān; Syriac: ḥamšā eiaḥē zīwānē), the sons of the First Man, were called in Parthian panj rōšn, "five Lights", revealing the same tradition as in Bd 18 and in WZs; this Parthian identification was prompted by Mār Ammō, not by Mānī. The Five elements include (Greek; Middle Persian; Parthian; Sogdian) "air/ether or breeze" (ἀήρ, frāwahr, ardāw frawardēn, ʾrṭ'w frwrl'y), "wind" (ἀνεμος, wād, w'ṭ), "light" (φῶς, rōšn), "water" (ὕδωρ, āb), "fire" (πῦρ, ādur, ʾp'ṭr); it was the sonship of Fire (note that Fire is regularly called in Zoroastrian texts Ohrmazd.pus, "the son of Ohrmazd") that prompted the inclusion of other elements, as there were five types of Fire presenting in the five stoichea (compare Bd 18.7).

11 29.2, Bailey 1943, 148: nēm.spihr, "hemisphere"; Henning 1942, 233 & n. 3: miyān zam'īg ud> spihr, "between the earth and the (lower) sphere".

12 Henning: "with (the help of) transcendent water".

13 Jewish Aramaic and Hebrew ʾwyr[ʾ], "air", is from Greek ἀήρ; Syriac forms are closer to the original Greek word; so, the Syriac Anonym of Rahmani (cf. Nyberg 1929, 238-241), speaking of the Zoroastrianism, used ʾʾr, whom he called one of the Elements (ʾstwksʾ), after Fire, Water, Earth, who all four together are gods inferior (ʾlh' d'styhwn dz'wryn brb'wthwn) to Ašīqar, Frašōqar, Zarōqar, Zurwān.

There is nothing uncommon in the fact that traditions going back to the Arsacid period (as in the case of Zands presumably utilized by Mānī and Mār Ammō) could survive into the Late Sasanian epoch, about the time when the extant Pahlavi Avesta was canonized. Boyce 1985b, 473a, observed that āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd ī abzōnīg, "the bountiful fire of Ohrmazd", of Dk 7.4 77 [TEXT X] (going, according to her view, directly to lost Avestan texts) is identified in Bd 18.14 as ādur ī Burzēn.Mihr. As the notion of this Parthian Fire being the most important of all the fires must go back to the Parthian period, Boyce suggested that the Dk 7 passage should be a remnant of a Parthian zand. Another fragment derived from the Arsacid period must be Wizigard ī Dēnīg 43 [TEXT XI]¹⁴.

It probably only remains to be noted that the Fire wāzišt became so prominent that it was inserted into newer texts, together with the demon Spinjār, cf. Vd 19.40 [TEXT XII]; PY 17.11; Bd 18.5 (and the quoted above Persian Rivāyat); it is remarkable that the episode of the Fire wāzišt and the demon Spinjār is not found in WZs 3.

This short study shows, I believe, that some errors in the interpretation of the Gāōic text were made at the pre-Sasanian (probably, Avestan?) stage of exegesis; that newer texts, including in Avestan, were composed at a rather late date; that some layers of pre-Sasanian traditions may be found; that features of the Zand known to Mānī can be revealed; that the sources of Bd 18 and WZs 3 were, though similar, not identical; that the source of WZs 3 had better readings; that the extant version of PY 36 is different from that underlying the sources of the commentaries on it as represented in Dk 9.

14 SmŠīrōzag 9, with its gloss āta(x)š ī Dārāy, "the Fire of Darius", may reflect an even older epoch, if the reading is correct. Dārāy, Darius, is mentioned in several Pahlavi texts, e.g., in Dk and in ZWY. An interesting passage is found in Bd 35A.2 (TD 2 236.15-237.1): ciyōn *Bāg andar Sāhpuhr ī Ohrmazdān Mōbedān Mōbed būd ud Kād andar Dārāy Wuzurg Framdār (sic! note that the spelling is identical to that used by Arabic authors) būd, "As *Bāg was the Mōbedān Mōbed under Sāhpuhr son of Ohrmazd, while (his ancestor) Kād was the Prime Minister under Dārāy".

Mythologization of History and Political Use of Zand

The sources dealing with apocalyptic and eschatological themes in the Zoroastrian Middle Persian Tradition include, *i.e.*, the apocalyptic passages in Dēnkard [Dk] 7.8-11, edited and translated in Molé 1967; Greater (Iranian) Bundahišn [Bd] 33-34, edited and translated in Anklesaria 1956; several chapters and passages in Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg [AyJ], edited and translated in Messina 1939; Jāmāsp Nāmag [JN] (=AyJ 16), edited and translated in Bailey 1930-32 and in Benveniste 1932 (cf. below); Zand ī Wahman Yasn/Yašt¹ [ZWY], edited and translated in Anklesaria 1957 (cf. now also Cereti 1995); Wizīdagihā ī Zādspram [WZs] 34-35, edited and translated in Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993; Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādistān ī Dēnīg [PRDD] 48-49, edited and translated in Williams 1990.

Some of these compositions, such as Bundahišn or Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg, could be easily defined as texts based on material drawn upon the lost parts of the Late Sasanian Avesta. Some components of these texts go back to the Pahlavi versions of particular Avestan texts, including Yašts, while other components are originally Pahlavi works (sometimes of non-Iranian provenance) of the Late Sasanian period².

To the last group belongs the Pahlavi ZWY, a late apocalyptic work of a very composite character. The Middle Persian apocalyptic texts are closely associated with eschatology, both personal and collective. It was frequently stated that apocalypics in general have their source in Iranian thinking, and that the Judæo-Christian apocalypics were heavily influenced by Iranian ideas. It is also a well-known fact that it was in Muslim Iran that apocalypics flourished. However, the evidence of the Zoroastrian, especially Avestan, sources is scanty. The text analyzed here is mostly ZWY, with its parallels. This composition, in its extant form, is of a rather late, while uncertain, date³; in the MSs, it generally follows Bd. The text was translated into English⁴ in West 1889, 189-235, Anklesaria 1957, Cereti 1995⁵. The division into chapters in the first and second translations is different. The division given here is that of Anklesaria, followed

¹ As to the name, cf. now Gignoux 1996b, 233.

² It should be remembered that not all the religious Zoroastrian Pahlavi literature of this period formed part of the Avesta.

³ Surely centuries after the fall of the Sasanian Empire.

⁴ Besides, several Gujarati and New Persian translations exist.

⁵ And into Hebrew by me in 1991 (unpublished). Besides, many Gujarati versions exist. The renowned Iranian author Sadeq Hedayat translated it into Modern Persian (*non vidi*).

also by Cereti⁶.

The text entitled Zand ī Wahman Yasn/Yašt⁷ is by no means a plain Zand of a supposed Avestan text, but rather a late combination of different apocalyptic and historical fragments of different length. The division into chapters made by Anklesaria, nevertheless, reflects, *grosso modo*, the original composite structure of the text and its different sources.

Chapter 1 and the second part of Chapter 3 go ultimately back to two different recensions of the same *Urtext*, mechanically combined in the extant form of ZWY; Chapter 2 is a small interpolation going back to one of the redactions of the text, made under Xusraw I Anōšurwān.

Chapter 4 goes back to sources common with JN (= AyJ 16), as does the first part of ZWY 3, although here the problem of sources is more complicated; Chapter 5 goes back to the original Pahlavi Zand of Ohrmazd Yašt, the second part of which Yašt, known as Wahman Yašt⁸, was also among the sources of ZWY; the last four chapters have more complicated source-history⁹. It is to be observed that glosses are not found at all in the three first¹⁰ chapters: all the glosses in the text are to be found only in 4. 9-10, 13, 26, 40, 67; 5. 6; 6. 2-3, 5-6, 9-12; 7. 2-7, 9-10, 19. There were scholars who argued that ZWY has a thorough Avestan substratum: so, Widengren 1967, 343, called ZWY "one of the most authentic Avestan texts in Pahlavi transmission".

⁶ Also by me in my Hebrew translation.

⁷ On the name, cf. Gignoux 1986a, *ibid.* 1986b; *ibid.* 1985-8; *ibid.* 1986-7; *ibid.* 1996b; Sundermann 1990a.

⁸ An Avestan hymn called by the tradition Wahman Yašt, of which we have a very distorted Pahlavi Zand, is known as the second part of the extant Ohrmazd Yašt, and, in my opinion, the Zand of this so-called Wahman Yašt has indeed some clear affinities with the text known now as Zand ī Wahman Yasn. Further, I shall try to prove that some ideas of the ZWY were derived from the Pahlavi version (of this Avestan text) which was larger than the extant one; nevertheless, it is not impossible that the identification of this second part of the Ohrmazd Yašt with the Wahman Yašt is of secondary character and is, actually, a relatively modern invention (a similarly situation exists in the case of the name of Zand ī Wahman Yasn). However, it is plausibly to suggest that the "spurious" name of Zand ī Wahman Yasn, and the source under this name quoted in ZWY, owe their existence to the "real" Wahman Yašt. There is some correspondence between the order of the Yašts and the order of the days of a Zoroastrian month (cf. Geldner 1904, 7; Hartman 1955; *ibid.* 1956; on the Yašt divinities and the Strōzag, cf. Wikander 1946, 229ff.). As Hartman noted, in several cases the name of a Yašt has nothing - or, very little - to do with its contents, and was given on the basis of the calendaric sequence. It seems that this is the reason why the second part of Ohrmazd Yašt, namely, Yt 1.23-33 (Darmesteter 1884, 31-34), got the name Wahman Yašt: the 1st day of the month is Ohrmazd, the 2nd being Wahman; contrary to the view expressed formerly by Gignoux, all the Amesāspentas were supposed to have a special Yašt, cf. Geldner 1904, 7 n.1, where Anquetil Duperron is quoted. Cf. also Chapter I, pp. 17-19.

⁹ E.g., ZWY 7.19-27 derives from JN, cf. Kippenberg 1978, 66.

¹⁰ And the last two.

Other scholars denied any Avestan substratum whatsoever, arguing for the extant ZWY being a late composition built from different fragments of the Zand (especially Gignoux¹¹, who argued that no Avestan original of ZWY ever existed).

ZWY 3.1 indicates as its source Zand of Wahman Yasn (with *Yasn emended into *Yašt by West¹²). It was stated that no such Yasna was known, and (as demonstrated by Gignoux 1985-8, 71-2) even the emended name of ZWY is a modern invention¹³.

But from a thorough study of the text it is clear that this is the most important Middle Persian Zoroastrian apocalyptic text derived from older sources, including those in Avestan; it is also evident that the text is a bit eclectic and mechanical¹⁴ composition from some apocalyptic texts [compare the case of ZWY 1 & 3], a fact that implies the existence of a richer literature of this genre.

ZWY 1.1-11 clearly refers to the S[t]ūdgār Nask (which ZWY itself quotes here as its source) as summarized in Dk 9.8 [APPENDIX I TEXT I]. The seventh fragard of the S[t]ūdgār Nask¹⁵ summarized in Dk 9.8 was based on the Gāθic Yasna 31. Dk 9.8.1 is an allusion to Y 31.14 [TEXTS II, III, IV], the *locus classicus* of the Avestan apocalyptic revelation (cf. Boyce 1984b, 57), where the prophet asks Ahura Mazda to grant him the knowledge of the end of the times. The Pahlavi version of this passage is *grosso modo* close to the original text, grasping the idea of the final reckoning prepared for the pious and the wicked ones.

It is especially the last gloss in [TEXT III] that is of interest here: it explains the "completion", being a Pahlavi transcription of the Avestan for "reckon", as "the final judgment in the end of times". Contrary to the PY [TEXT III], the version given in the summary of the Warštmanšār Nask, Dk 9.31.18 [TEXT IV], emphasizes overtones of the personal, rather than collective, eschatology. This passage is rather moralistic; there is nothing apocalyptic about it, especially when one reads both versions against their ZWY parallels, and the most

important thing about the last-quoted Dēnkard passage is that there is no allusion to the ham.pursagīh, "conference", between Ohrmazd and Zoroaster regarding the fate of the world.

This ham.pursagīh and the world history are the themes of ZWY 1 [TEXT V] and ZWY 3.19-29 [TEXT VI]. The Tree Vision is presented in ZWY 1 [TEXT V] and ZWY 3.19-29 [TEXT VI] in two slightly different versions. It was the acknowledgeable common origin of both versions that prompted them to be put together in the same late composition, despite all the differences between them.

ZWY 1 and Dk 9.8 are more closely related to each other than to ZWY 3.19ff., not only because both of them represent the scheme of four ages; all three of them place the golden age in the time-frame in which Ohrmazd and Zoroaster had a conference, while the two versions given in ZWY merge this age with that of Wištāsp; Dk 9 considers Wištāsp's reign as the silver age. The silver age according to the two versions of ZWY is that of Ardašēr/Artaxšaθr, i.e., the Sasanian Ardašēr I / the Achæmenid Artaxerxes¹⁶ (representing, for that matter, the whole dynasty). From ZWY 1.9 it seems plausible to suggest that the figure of the Kayāniān king Ardašēr represents a contamination of the Achæmenid Artaxerxes, Ardašēr ī Wahman, son of Spandiyād/Isfandiyār, who is Cyrus the Just, called also Ardašēr ī Spandiyādān, with the Sasanian Ardašēr ī Pābagān¹⁷ (in the mythologized history, Artaxerxes and Xerxes are thus the same person¹⁸).

The Sasanians claimed to be descendants of the Achæmenids, this idea presenting also in Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr ī Pābagān [=KNAP] 1¹⁹. It is possible that the name of Dārāy ī Dārāyān (known also from the Dk, AWN etc.) was derived from a non-Iranian source, although

11 Gignoux 1986a; *ibid.* 1986b; *ibid.* 1985-8; 1986-7; but cf. now Gignoux 1996b, 233.

12 Cf. Sundermann 1990a, 492. However, the -št / -šn / -sn variants are common in different forms of Persian, cf. Paper 1976. In the Dk texts, the variation Yašt / Yasn is frequently found. For both forms Wahman Yašt / Wahman Yasn used in the same paper, cf. Gignoux 1996b, 233.

13 Similarly to the case of the name of Bundahīšn or Zand ī Agāth, cf. MacKenzie 1989, 547.

14 Nevertheless, the composite structure of ZWY as compared to the sources of this text is of great interest and I will study it elsewhere.

15 Wahman Yasn is quoted only once in ZWY 3, while S[t]ūdgār Nask is both quoted and alluded to. The original S[t]ūdgār Nask spoke of overcoming of Dahāg by Frēddōn, and about the onrush of the Māzandarān Giants onto X'ānīrāh. Then the people complained to Frēddōn (Dk 9.21.8): "Why did you overcome him, as his servants guarded us from the Giants?", West 1892, 214. The episode is alluded to at the end of ZWY.

16 Although the historical value of the Pahlavi orthography is uncertain, it is worthwhile noting that the second ZWY version (ZWY 3.24) uses the Late Old Persian / Early Middle Persian form of the name. The identification of the king of ZWY 3.24 with Artaxerxes seems firm as the king is called a son of a mythological personage. The proximity in time between this king to Wištāsp, indicated by putting both of them into the silver age, by different accounts, has some bearing on the "traditional date of Zoroaster".

17 Cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 103.

18 Pace Hintze 1994.

19 The chapter which otherwise contains [KNAP 1.6] an expression comparable to ZWY 1.8 (ō wirēg ud nīhān rawīšnīh ēstād).

it is difficult to tell from which²⁰. But the pretension is obvious: the authors of the KNP saw Ardašēr as the heir to the kings of the First Iranian Empire.

Ṭabari's source described the blood-revenge "for his remote ancestral cousin Dārā, the son of Dārā, the son of Bahman the son of Isfandiyār who has fought against Alexander" as an excuse for restoring the borders of the Empire, waging a war against the "Romans"²¹.

Šāhpūr II wrote to the Roman emperor Constantius: "I Shapur, King of Kings, the partner with the Stars, brother of the Sun and the Moon, offer my brother Constantius Caesar most cordial greetings... That my ancestors held sway as far as the river Strymon and the boundaries of Macedonia your ancient records also bear witness; these lands it behooves me to demand... on all occasions the right reason²² is my chief concern... Accordingly, it is my bounden duty to recover Armenia together with Mesopotamia, which carefully planned deception wrested from my grandfather ...".

Frendo 1993, 61, noted that the territorial claim is the same as that attributed by Dio Cassius to Ardašēr some 127 years earlier: "he would recover everything that the ancient Persians had once held as far as the Greek Sea, on the grounds that all this too belonged to him through his forefathers". Šāhpūr also claimed for the restoration of Iran (ŠKZ MP 21-22): [ʔPn ʔAHRN]c [K]BYR št[ry BʔYHWNst], "and We claimed (xʔāst) many other lands".

Yarshater 1971, 519, spoke of "historical amnesia" of the Sasanian Iranians, having stated that all recollection of the Achæmenid era was lost, but in fact the Sasanians were very effective in using "historical-based propaganda", not-unknown from some kinds of modern nationalism; their historical remembrance was selective, but real, as they knew what was the actual territorial extent of the Achæmenids²³, whatever the source.

20 The phonetic form of the name Dārā[y] may go back to the Greek Δαρεῖος. Not so does the alternative form Dārāb surviving, e.g., in Sahrestānīhā ī Erān § 42: šahrestān ī Dārābgird Dārāy ī Dārāyān kard, "the city of Dārābgird built Dārāy son of Dārāy", cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 93-4.
21 Cf. Frendo 1993.
22 *paymān; on the concept, cf. Shaked 1987a.
23 Frendo 1993, 62.

No Book Pahlavi source known to us earlier than the KNP (the 6th c. CE²⁴) claimed Achæmenid descent for Sasanian kings; the great Sasanian inscriptions used terms such as *MYN* *šyhr MN yʔzt* or *bg* where the Achæmenids used their tribal/familiar name²⁵ (cf. also Sundermann 1988, on *šyhr MN yʔzt*, Sāsān used as a divine name²⁶, *bg*). It seems that the earlier kings claimed to be of divine origin, while the later ones claimed Achæmenid descent, perhaps under the impression of the propaganda of Wahrām ī Cōbēn's loyalists, who maintained that Ardašēr had robbed the kingdom from the Arsacids.

It seems that the source of the legend about the Achæmenid descent of the last Zoroastrian dynasty was a foreign one, namely, Greek or Syriac (from Greek); after all, Dārāy ī Dārāyān was to be understood as *Darius III Codoman, from the family of Darius the Great²⁷. The only significance of Darius III Codoman was that he was killed as a result of Alexander's invasion and that is why his name was kept in the Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes'. Though the evidence is too limited to determine what was the real extent of knowledge of the Achæmenid past in the Sasanian epoch, nevertheless, Šāhpūr's letters to the Byzantine Caesar reveal substantial historical memory. The fact that Alexander was once identified in ZWY 6.5 as YŪnān, against the normal *Hrōmāyīg ("Byzantine"), might indicate²⁸ a pre-Sasanian source of some parts of the composition²⁹.

The Sasanian rock-inscriptions reveal affinities with their 700-year-older pendants in Old Persian and their contemporary Manichæan texts, both drawing upon a common source of the formulæ of the older literary language, which may be even older than the Old Persian inscriptions³⁰. J.R. Russell³¹ pondered upon the possible literary antecedents of Kīrdēr's inscriptions, which have no Sasanian parallels; the most fertile ground for comparison, according to Russell, is offered by Xerxes "anti-Daiva" inscriptions, with its belligerent overtones.

24 Cf. Cunakova 1987, *Vvedenie*.

25 Cf. Skjærvø 1985, 594.

26 Now, also Livshits 1984, 26; MacKenzie 1986, 114; Gignoux 1990b, 142 [cf. Naveh & Shaked 1985, 35], cf. Gignoux 1990c, 235 [a different explanation in M. Schwartz in *BAI* NS 10: *non videt*].

27 Cf. 8d 35A.2 (TD 2 236.15-237.1): clyōn *Bāg andar Šāhpūr ī Ohrmazdān Mōbedān Mōbed būd ud Kād andar Dārāy Wuzurg Framadār (*sic*) būd, "as *Bāg was the Mōbedān Mōbed under Šāhpūr son of Ohrmazd, while (his ancestor) Kād was the Prime Minister under Dārāy". Cf. Chapter III.IV, p. 144 n. 14, and n. 20 above.

28 Cf. Cereti 1995, 141, 160. The reading is, however, uncertain.

29 Cf. Eddy 1962, 19.

30 Cf. Skjærvø 1985, 603.

31 "A Parthian Bhagavad Gita" (forthcoming).

ZWY 3.24, which states that "Artaxerxes" "separated dēws from men", could be a real echo of Xerxes³² adam alvam daivadānam viyakanam utā patiyazbayam: "daivā mā yadiyaišat", "and I made proclamation, 'the demons shall not be worshipped!'".

So, it is not impossible that under Artaxšāθr / "Artaxerxes" of ZWY 3.24, who "will separate the dēws from men, restore the whole world and propagate the Religion", some remote memory of Xerxes was actually preserved.

In this regard, it is not without interest that the Sasanians used to engrave their monumental inscriptions, after the Achaemenid model, mostly in the first decades of their long rule³³, i.e., shortly after the "restoration". Thus, the shattering of *daēvic* images attributed to Wištāsp in ZWY 1.8 does not necessarily represent the later Sasanian iconoclasm, but can indeed be an old literary topos.

ZWY 3.25, immediately following the Artaxšāθr fragment, is of great interest as well: it identifies the brass age with the Sasanian dynasty, naming first Artaxšāθr, spelt differently from the name of his Achaemenid name-mate (the same occurs also in Bd 33.15). This corresponds to ZWY 1.9, which calls the silver age that of Artaxšāθr "the Kayānian", the epithet being taken from ZWY 3.24. In Dk 9.8 the silver age is that of Wištāsp, standing for something (Arsacids?) which was deliberately omitted (the ZWY accounts put the ages of Zoroaster and Wištāsp together, which makes good sense).

ZWY 3.25 enumerates in the silver age also Šāhpuhr (clearly, Šāhpuhr I, son of Ardašēr), and Ādurbād, who underwent the brass ordeal. Obviously, this refers to the Sasanian period up to Xusraw Anōšurwān. ZWY 1.10 and Dk 9.8.4 seem to blend together the period of this king and of Ādurbād. These two sources call the period that of steel, while ZWY 3.25 names it that of brass, perhaps, under the impact of the *roy*-ordeal (ZWY 3.28, too, knows the period of Xusraw Anōšurwān as that of steel).

ZWY 3.26 puts the copper period in the times of an Arsacid king, absent from the other two versions; the chronological order is, of course, wrong, but brass, being a more noble metal than copper, caused the new dynasty to be placed under this metal, instead of the defeated Arsacids, adding thus to this the above-mentioned impact of the word *roy*. This passage thus indicates that the original order was different, and it goes back, in that form or another, to pre-Sasanian times.

32 XPh 37-9, Kent 1953, 151.

33 This while the claims to the Achaemenid origin begin, as was previously noted, only towards the end of the dynasty.

However, the passage was textualized anew in the Sasanian times, as it defines Alexander as "ecclesiastical", i.e., Byzantine-Christian. On the other hand, AyJ 15.18 puts *Walā[x]š, the king called "Arsacid" in ZWY 3.26, after Wahrām ī Gōr (r. 420-38), Yazdgird II (r. 438-57), Pērōz (r. 459-84), but before Kawād I (r. 488-96, 498-531).

Actually, *Walā[x]š is a restoration, though a safe one, in the text. This was the name of the 14th Sasanian King who ruled for 4 years (484-8). If a Sasanian king was meant, it makes perfect sense chronologically. The problem is, of course, that the text implicitly has here Aškanān, "Arsacids", and, as we know from the Dēnkar d, the Arsacids were indeed mentioned in the tradition of Zandists. We have only to suggest that the passage speaks indeed of the Arsacids and that it belongs to an earlier redaction and is displaced.

As to accuracy in knowledge of Sasanian chronology and the names of the kings, cf. GrBd 36.934: Arda[x]štr ī Pābagān ud Sāsānān *a-mar, "Ardaštr son of Pābag and the countless Sasanians". In AyJ 15.5-6 it is said that after Alexander the rule will pass to husraw Partawān, "the renowned Parthians"³⁵, then Iran will prosper, and, as it is at odds with the standard Sasanian slander of the Arsacid rule, a Parthian transmission of some of the material was suggested³⁶.

However, Walā[x]š was still honored even under the Sasanians for his service to the religion³⁷. There is no doubt that the information about Walā[x]š found in various Pahlavi texts goes back to the Parthian king-lists³⁸. On the other hand, the Sasanian Iranians were not

34 Cf. Anklesaria 1956, 307, TD1 103r.3, DH 230r.11.

35 Pas az hān o Alaksandar ī Hrōmāyīg sēzdah sāi. Pas bē o lōhmag ī *Aršag rasēd, o husraw Partawān rasēd, dārēnd dōwist ud haštād ud dō sāi, pad awēšān xVadāyān sar ī anāgīh andag andag, pas āyēd nēwagīh spurīg ud kišwar andar ābādānīh ud abēbēmīh ud mardom andar kāmāg zīwišnīh dāšt ēštād bawēnd, "after that, 13 years (of rule) for Alexander the [Eastern-] Roman (Byzantine; the translation depends on the date of the passage). Then it (the rule) will pass to those of the seed of *Aršak, it will pass to the renown Parthians, and the will hold it for 282 years, during which the rulers will turn towards so much evil, then the complete goodness will come and they will keep the country in prosperity and without fear and the people in the desire for living". Cf. 8d, *ibid.*, Aškanān ī pad ahlāw xVadāyīh nām barēnd, "the Arsacids, who are renown for their righteous rule".

36 Cf. Boyce 1987b, 127a.

37 Cf. Boyce 1984b, 12.

38 Parthian fragments exist in other Pahlavi sources as well: thus, e.g., in AyJ, Jāmāsp is given the Parthian title of bīdaxš.

ignorant of their own history³⁹.

It was frequently stated that the knowledge of Alexander possessed by the Sasanians and the Iranians of the Islamic period came almost entirely from the Romance of Alexander⁴⁰. It was legendary⁴¹, if not mythical, and it seems that Alexander became one of the heroes - or one should rather say, *anti-heroes* - of the Iranian Epic. It is plausible to suggest that seeking more information about Alexander, Iranians even turned to the Greek tradition.

It was earlier supposed that the Syriac version of the Alexander Romance was translated from Pahlavi⁴²; however, this view was later rejected (cf. Frye 1985⁴³). But there existed indeed two Iranian traditions, a learned one reflected in Dk 5.3.3; 7.7.3,7, KNP 1, AWN 1 etc., and a folkloristic one, which made Alexander a scion of Achaemenid kings, thus, an owner of *xVarnah*, only that may have justified in the eyes of the common folk the sorrowful fact that the throne of the King of Kings fell to strangers⁴⁴. As to our text, ZWY 3.26⁴⁵ states that the Arsacids were those who liberated Iran from the Greco-Macedonians, which is historically correct.

It was argued that Iranian apocalyptic texts, of which ZWY is the best representative, were largely composed under the impact of the "Oriental" opposition to the Hellenistic cultural imperialism. Under this aspect, it is important that ZWY 1.10 & 3.29 depicts the enemies of Iran as "having dishevelled hair". Although this expression is an old Iranian one (cf. below), it was Eddy 1962, 13, who rightly connected the parallel locus in the Sybilline Oracle with the known portrait of Alexander displayed in the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos, whose copy was

39 Thus, e.g., *Sahrestānīhā* I Erān § 32 informs us that: 9 *šahrestān andar zamīg ī Gazīrah kard ēstōd ī Amtōs ī Qaišar brādar-zād kard*, "9 towns in the Jazīrah were founded by Amtos, the nephew of the Caesar". Amtōs is probably Aurelius Verus, cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 82.

40 Cf. Hanaway 1990, 95.

41 Cf. *Sahrestānīhā* I Erān § 53: *šahrestān ī Gay gujastag Ataksandar ī Fīlipōs* kard mānišn ī Yahūdān ānōh būd ī pad xVadāyih Yazdgird ī Sāhpuhrān burd az xVāhišn ī Sōšanduxt īš zan būd, "the city of Gay (=Ispahān) was built by the accused Alexander son of Philip, there was a dwelling of the Jews there, whom Yazdgird son of Sāhpuhr brought in his reign, according to desire of Sōšanduxt, his wife", cf. Marquart 1903, 48ff.; Markwart/Messina 1931, 104-5; *ibid.*, § 12: *šahrestān ī Marw ud šahrestān ī Harāt gujastag Sōkandar ī Hrōmāyīg kard*, "the city of Marw and the city of Harāt were built by the accused Byzantine Sōkandar [=Alexander]". The form Sōkandar may reflect a hint to the tradition about Alexander's burning ["sōk-"] of the Avesta.

42 Cf. Nöldeke 1880, 12-15.

43 Frye 1985, 185-8, esp. p.188, with previous bibliography.

44 Alexander descended from the Egyptian Pharaoh Nectanebus/Nictobarus in the Syriac [and Hebrew] versions, compare Alexander described as *Mušrīg.mānišn*, "dwelling in Egypt" in AWN 1.

45 This tradition is absent from Bd 33.

preserved at Pomepae⁴⁶.

As to the tree symbolism, an anti-Macedonian text⁴⁷, Sybil III, 388-95, makes reference to the tree of ten branches⁴⁸. It is to be observed that here the tree of ten branches seems to be associated with the period of Alexander, while in ZWY the ages were named after the Iranian dynasts, and only the last age, surely a later addition, is that of the Arabs. This seems to prove that the notion of the tree whose branches symbolize ages was known as early as in the post-Achaemenid period, when the idea of the subsequent kingdoms has not yet developed. On the other hand, already in this Sybilline fragment one finds a link between the future compositions of ZWY and AWN 1: as Eddy, *ibid.*, has noted, this Sybilline text describing "Alexander as going to Hades, has a similarity with AWN 1, which says that Alexander, after having wreaked havoc in Iran, flees to hell. Swain 1940 has shown that a Roman author, Sura, writing prior to 171 BCE, when the Romans still knew nothing of the Jews (with their Daniel scheme), already had the developed theory of the sequence of the monarchies in the East (Assyria-Media-Persia-Macedonia). At the Achaemenid court there was a golden plane tree kept as a permanent fixture, decorated with a mass of jewels, and it was "worshipped and hymned by the Persians, and it was under this tree that the king held court", cf. Eddy 1962, 27⁴⁹, a fact that most probably indicates existence of the tree/age symbolism.

As Olsson 1983, 28-9, has noted, phenomenological parallels to the notion of the four periods represented by the four-metals scheme are known not only from Hesiod (7th century BCE), Daniel and ZWY, but also among the Mayas and the Aztecs. Having many common traits, and, basically, not necessarily having been derived from the same source, these apocalyptic features are not unique and are to be found even in cultures not affected by the Mediterranean Civilization, as in the case of native-American [and other Third World] Messianic movements. This observation was first noted by Flusser 1964, 85, while treating Jewish apocalypses, in his Review of Eddy 1962, and later, independently, by Russell⁵⁰.

46 Hertzfeld, quoted in Asmussen 1968 (cf. also Asmussen 1969), compared the Old Persian expression as regarding Cambyzes' death with *xVad.škast ō dušax' dwārist*, on Alexander, in AWN 1.2.

47 Eddy 1962, 12.

48 The fact that we have seven branches in *Zarātušt.Nāmah*, 1309, implies that the number of branches was not stable and new "branches" corresponding to the latter rulers were added. On the other hand, it also implies that *Zarātušt.Nāmah*, 1309, goes back to sources older than those of ZWY 3. Widengren 1983 saw the scheme of the 4 periods as original and old, connected to Zurvanistic speculations. Although one could hardly argue against the original and old character of the four-fold scheme, its "Zurvanite" nature is highly doubtful.

49 On plane and vine trees in the Achaemenid cult, connected with royalty, cf. Eddy 1962, 26-8.

50 References to Native-American material (on Spartacus, Zealots and Ghost Dance) while dealing with Avestan and connected subjects were constantly made by J.R. Russell on different occasions, as in Russell 1993 (n. 17 in the MS version).

Not having been derived from God's revelation to Abraham, as Christianity and Islam are, Zoroastrian Tradition has, however, amazingly vast numbers of common features with the three "Semitic" religions; there were, of course, numerous cases of mutual impact and influence, in both directions, but, the depth structures of Historical Judaism and Zoroastrian Tradition must be seriously taken into consideration when dealing with the nature of apocalypics in these two traditions.

As Flusser 1964, 86, noted, "it is no accident that in the period of antiquity a genuine eschatological Apocalypse arose amidst two peoples, the Jewish and the Persian; for the religion of both nations according to its innate structure and message is pointing towards the end of time".

The case of the Biblical book of Daniel is of crucial importance here. Scholars saw in ZWY 1 perceptions comparable with Nebuchadnezzar's vision in Daniel 2.27-45, and also with Daniel 7. It was stated, until recently, that these parts of Daniel were influenced by Irano-Mesopotamian ideas (Hultgård 1979, 525; Olsson 1983; Boyce 1984b, 70-2). On the other hand, Bickerman 1967, 68, 117, and Duchesne-Guillemin 1982, 758-9, argued for the direct dependence of the Iranian idea of successive world empires on the Jewish sources. Sundermann 1990a thought it possible to see the metallic symbolism of Daniel's "statue" as original. If Sundermann's view is correct, then we have rather a piece of common Iranian-Jewish mythological speculation. In this context, it is important to note that Daniel is a figure belonging to pre-Israelite times. The imagery of the Book of Daniel contains many Ugaritic-Anatolian motifs, prominent also in the Qumran literature and in the Book of Giants. On the other hand, one finds some traits of common Jewish-Iranian lore also in the Hārūt and Mārūt legends preserved in the Dēnkard account⁵¹.

Scholars who denied the supposed Iranian impact on Daniel have argued that ZWY is a very late text, or that the 4-metals pattern derives from Greek sources⁵². As to the argument that ZWY is a "young" text (previously dated as late as the epoch of the Crusades), a similar claim was made in the case of another Iranian apocalyptic text, Qisṣa-ye Dāniyāl (a Judæo-Persian composition which was also attributed erroneously to the same late epoch⁵³).

As to the well-known controversy over whether the metals in Daniel were derived from the supposed Iranian tradition or from Hesiod, cf. Gignoux 1985-B8, 71, after Duchesne-Guillemin 1982, rightly argued that the metals in ZWY, as applied to a tree, are clearly non-Iranian.

⁵¹ I hope to treat these subjects elsewhere.

⁵² Cf. Olsson 1983, 26 n. 33-4.

⁵³ However, the text of Qisṣa-ye Dāniyāl, although brought to date, is based on very old Jewish sources, going back to the late Second Commonwealth period, cf. Shapira 1999. I will deal with the sources of this Judæo-Persian text elsewhere.

It may be indeed an idea borrowed from India, together with other Indian teachings⁵⁴, which became incorporated in the Sasanian Avesta.

Regarding the chronological speculations of ZWY, it should be observed that the date of Zoroaster, whose tenth millennium is frequently alluded to in this composition, is a complicated business. While I have no intention to provide here my own solution to this old controversy, it is, nevertheless, to my opinion, that the date has a bearing for our texts.

According to the Zoroastrian tradition, the Religion was revealed in 754 BCE, thus 232 years before Darius' accession to the throne, 970 years before the birth of Mānī, thus Zoroaster's life span lasted from 784 to 707 BCE⁵⁵.

This was the reason why Mānī considered himself as being Hōšēdar, i.e., a Zoroastrian Messiah, having been born 970 years after the revelation of the Mazdayasnan faith, according to Ptolemy Canon's chronology⁵⁶. The years of his youth were full of tumult, including the fall of the Arsacid dynasty, which was seen as a fulfillment of Zoroaster's prophecy about the end of the millennium. Klīma 1958, 560-4, proved that millenaristic expectations were current in Iran about Mānī's time, a fact that presumably pushed Mānī to believe that he himself was the Hōšēdar. According to his own calculations, Mānī was born 30 years before the end of the Prophet's millennium. Thus, aged 30, he introduced himself to the King of Kings' Court, at the Naurōz festival, as proper to Prophets. This is a very important trait, because his activity as Mānāhēm, Maitreya and Paraclete he began some 5 years earlier, circa 240 CE, implying that he deliberately waited for the coming date of Hōšēdar.

After their victory, the Sasanians were interested both in calming down the millenaristic fears and promulgating their own Messianic rôle. It was at this time that the chronology was falsified. According to Mas'ūdī's (ed. de Goeje 1894, 97) Kitābu'l-Tanbīh wa'l-ṭiṣṭāf, the Sasanian chronological forgery was, however, known in some circles, affirming that the forgery was "a religious and political secret of the Persians", wa huwa sirr diyānt mulūkt min 'asrār l-Furs. Perhaps this is one of the meanings of the word *zand* used in

⁵⁴ A comprehensive study of Indian material in Sasanian Iran is still lacking; many particular points were referred to by different authors; cf., e.g., Bailey 1943, 86; de Menasce 1949, 1-3; Tavaria 1956, 70; Shaked 1984a, 49-50. For the Dēnkard allusions to Indian sciences, cf. DKM 428.

⁵⁵ Klīma 1958, 563-4.

⁵⁶ Klīma 1958, 562.

ZWY 2: one who claimed knowledge of the unauthorized chronology was called *zandīg*⁵⁷.

The chronological falsification was by no means made about the very end of the Sasanian Period, because Agathias, writing *circa* 550 CE, assisted by his Persian interpreter Sergius, already considered the Arsacid epoch as lasted for 270 years only⁵⁸. Actually, the five centuries and a half that had elapsed since Alexander (corresponding almost exactly to the beginnings of the Seleucid Era) till the establishment of the Sasanian dynasty were reduced to 266 years by the Sasanian *agitprop*.

It was made because about 850 years have elapsed since the "traditional date of Zoroaster", thus, almost no time was left for the new dynasty. The falsification was achieved by identifying the Era of Zoroaster, "traditional date of Zoroaster", with the current Seleucid Era, and Ardašīr ī Pābagān made it to appear that only 566 years out of the millennium of Zoroaster had elapsed, thus aspiring to add some 434 years to his own new dynasty. Thus, the end of the millennium of Zoroaster was supposed to take place in 659 (225 + 434 = 659). And indeed, the last Sasanian king, Yazdgird III, was murdered in 651-2 CE⁵⁹.

If we turn now to ZWY 3.1-18 [TEXT VII], this is where ZWY proper, without the first two chapters added later, begins. Being an epitome of [the main source of] ZWY⁶⁰ (which I will call "the original ZWY", though bearing in mind the tentativeness of such a name), this chapter, until ZWY 3.19ff., is modeled on "the original ZWY", while beginning from 3.19 an enlarged version of ZWY 1 is given. The next portion of the original ZWY begins from 7.3 until the end. The portion in between is taken from S[ī]t[ī]dgār Nask, not from *Wahman Yašt/Yasn, as the S[ī]t[ī]dgār Nask spoke of destroying of Dahāg by Frēdōn.

57 Cf. 'Alī bin Ḥazm's Kitāb-ī Fasl fī-ī Milāl wa-ī Ahwā' (cf. Pines 1990, 43), where it was stated that Anušīrwān forbade the study [of the books] in any place in their country other than Ardašīr.Xorra and Eša M.n.dā Gird. Before him (the religion) was only studied in Istaxr, and this was permitted to special élite. Their book which remained after it had been burnt by Alexander, contained 23 sifr. Sāhpūhr II, after Adurbād underwent, successfully, his molten brass ordeal, addressed (DKM 413.5ff.) "to all those sectarians who also study the Nasks and to the heretics", etc., abāg hamāg awēšān jud.*sardagān ud *Nask.ōšmurdānāz ud Jud.ristagān..., implying that study of the Nasks, i.e. the Zands, was regarded as containing a trait of unorthodoxy, thus it must be restricted. It is worth noting that the heretics are designated here as jud.*sardagānand Jud.ristagān, not as zandīg.

58 Klīma 1958, 563.

59 Among the authors who dealt with the problem of the "traditional date": Taqizadeh 1940, Henning 1951, Klīma 1958, Shahbazi 1977, Gnoli 1980, Humbach 1984a.

60 Cf. West 1904 194 n. 4.

In the beginning of ZWY 1 and ZWY 3, the Prophet asked for four boons from the Creator, two of which are the knowledge of the future and immortality until the Resurrection⁶¹. The four boons were divided between Wištāsp, Jāmāsp, Isfendiyār and Pašutan (who took immortality with milk (Pašutan az ān dar tarāf šīr dād bixward u hayāward az marg yad, according to Zarādušt-Nāmah, pp. 77 ll. 1170).

Later in the Zarādušt-Nāmah we are told that the Prophet asked for the immortality, but was denied, while (p. 84, ll. 1286-7):

bīdādaš Xudāy-ī jīhān āfarīn

yakī čīz mānandah-ī angubīn

ba Zartušt guftā kih yak quṭrah xward

bīgō ānčih bīnī bamā dar badar,

"the Lord of the World blessed him and gave him something similar to honey. He said to Zoroaster: "Drink a drop of it and tell Me what you will see around you! (or: in details)",

implying that āb.kīr.b, "that which has the form of water" (ZWY 3.6) was changed to "something similar to honey". The same beverage, which Wištāsp is supposed to drink, appears in PRDD 139.13-18 as mang andar ō may [kun!], "[mix]mang with wine[!]", while in Dk 7.4.84ff. one reads abar hōm ud mang amāh rāy barē ō Wištāsp, "take for us to Wištāsp haoma with mang" (cf. Widengren 1983a, 103-4).

After drinking that beverage, the Prophet⁶², according to the Zarādušt-Nāmah,

bīdānast čand ast bar gōsfand zi moy u zi rang u zi čōn u zi čand,

"He knew how much hair the cattle have, what is their color and manner",

where a microcosm / macrocosm speculation is to be looked for. This counting of the cattle's hairs in the Zarādušt-Nāmah, ll. 1292-3, reflects the same tradition as that of ZWY 3.9,

61 In my view, this particular tradition goes back to the very close circle of the Prophet: while Zoroaster was still alive, he believed, like Jesus and Muhammad, that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, to use the language of another religious tradition.

62 P. 85, l. 1292-3.

where it is set in the context which speaks of ages symbolized by metals. It is relevant to refer here to an Iranian myth preserved for us by Bīrūnī, though, it seems, in a distorted form. Bīrūnī⁶³, quoting al-Bābī, informs that according to Persian savants, Jam (Yima) has seen Kākīl (*Kay-ī Gīl?) in the form of a man containing all the colors, riding a bull. The bull was of 7 substances: gold, silver, yellow copper/brass (šufīr), (red) copper (nuḥās), iron, lead (rašāš), brass/lead (*ānuk). This bull symbolized the *farr* of the world, according to the explanation given by Bīrūnī himself. This piece of mythological information is of great importance, as it is not connected with ZWY 1-3, while sharing common features, thus proving that the motifs of the seven metals found in ZWY 1-3 and the vision of Zoroaster in which (ZWY 3.9) the hairs of animals/cattle are referred to were not combined mechanically, but rather reflect a lost myth.

It is obvious that this mystic rapture of Zoroaster who drank the wisdom in the form of water and beheld the future is a very short and somehow distorted and incomplete⁶⁴ version of such well-known soul-journeys as those of Kirdēr or Ardā Wirāz⁶⁵. But unlike the soul-journeys of Kirdēr or Ardā Wirāz (and that of Zoroaster in ZWY 3.15-18), whose aim is to provide a proof of the veracity and benefit of the Zoroastrian faith, the prophetic dream of Zoroaster in ZWY 1 and ZWY 3.19-29 serves a different purpose, namely to provide consolation in the times of hardship: if the first part of the prophecy predicting the coming of evil times in the end of Zoroaster's millennium (ZWY 1.11, 3.29) is fulfilled, so should be fulfilled the prophecy concerning the coming of the Savior and the future redemption. The rest of ZWY, beginning with ZWY 4, is dedicated to an elaboration of both parts of the prophecy.

The short chapter 2 of ZWY [TEXT VIII] seems to be an independent unit taken from some secondary compilation (of the type of Bd, WZs, MX etc.). In my own opinion, ZWY 2 is a genuine *verbatim* quotation from earlier text[s], though it was supposed (cf. Czeglédy 1958, 34-35) that the reference to different texts - (the *Zand*[s] of) the Wahman Yasn, Xurdaš Yasn and Aštād Yasn) as containing the same statement, together with naming of several known authorities, looks suspicious. Nevertheless, Widengren 1983a, 102, 104, took the existence of the three sources for granted.

⁶³ Khalidov 1959, text: 159; translation: 167.

⁶⁴ Cf. Gignoux 1986a, 58.

⁶⁵ The expression ūm [nē] burzišnīg sahist repeated in ZWY 3.15-18 is typical for Awn, cf. Gignoux 1986a, 58-9.

It is of importance that ZWY 7.24 also mentions the Xurdaš and Amurdaš Yasns. The Pahlavi text there runs as follows: ... pad ham.zōtīh yazīšn frāz sāzēnd, barsom frāz wistarēnd ud yazēnd Xurdaš ud Amurdaš Yasn, pad nērang ud Nērangestān ī dēnīg, "... with joint invocation they will prepare the Yazīšn ceremony, spread forth the barsom twigs, and celebrate the Xurdaš and Amurdaš Yasns with nērang-incantations and the Avestan Nērangestān". In the parallel passage (ZWY 8.7) the reference to these texts is absent. It is impossible to decide whether the reference to the Xurdaš and Amurdaš Yasns was provoked in ZWY 7.24 by ZWY 2. As to the Xurdaš Yasn and Aštād Yasn proper, they are known, but they are short and based on other texts. No eschatological information would be supplied from their Avestan form; to this must be added that the apocalyptic material of the Sasanian Avesta belonged mostly to Dāmdād, Cihrdād, Spand and Sītīdgar Nasks (cf. Widengren 1983a, 155). Again, one could easily note that the first three chapters of ZWY contain themes and vocabulary which ZWY shares with Awn⁶⁶. The religious authorities mentioned in ZWY 2 appear also in the Sāyist nē Sāyist, Nērangestān, Phlvd, PY and Dk; they were studied in de Menasce 1983 and in Gignoux 1986a and 1986b. This evidence indicates that ZWY could have been drawn upon sources other than the quoted in ZWY itself.

Widengren 1983a, 90, noted that all the redactions of ZWY were made as a result of some collision with other faiths / heresies. This is the reason given for this text being composed, and such a situation might be an explanation for some discrepancies with religious teaching known in public previously (e.g., "the *real* teaching was unknown as the teaching were of secretive character"), or, rather, for the text itself being previously unknown ("it was kept in secret to conceal the truth from the heretics, but now it became revealed").

However, it could be taken for granted that the era of the struggle against the heresies must have left some impact on the literary activities of the clergy. What is sure is that the text of ZWY 2 cannot be dated prior to the epoch of Anōšur wān (cf. Gignoux 1986a, 58).

Dk 9.6.2 [TEXT IX], e.g., probably refers to Mazdak, while trying to play down his religious rank⁶⁷ and accusing him (?) of "foreignness" (it is to be noted that no accusation of "foreignness" was turned on Mānī, cf. Chapter III.3). On the other hand, it is absolutely

⁶⁶ Even the textual traditions of ZWY and Awn have some cross-points: one of these could be, e.g., the use of the strange expression ēw bār, "one time", "once", which appears in ZWY 2 and in Awn 1.

⁶⁷ Mazdak, as is well known, was a religious authority of the highest rank (mōbadān.mōbad). Nevertheless, some texts could have been unknown even to him, because, i.a., sometimes Avestan texts were better known than the *Zand*, cf. Shaked 1969a, 190-3, esp. p. 192.

impossible that such an event as the fall of the Empire after the Islamic invasion left no impact on the literary activity of the Zoroastrian priests and scribes.

Bd 33 is a composite text of mostly mythological character in the middle of which a passage is inserted taken from the *XV adāy Nāmag*, the passage in question being perhaps the only surviving authentic *Pahlavi* fragment of this Sasanian chronicle; its style is dry, objective and narrative, and is amazingly close in tone to the style of Arabic re-workings of the *XV adāy Nāmag*. In order to illustrate this point, here are some short excerpts in translation (Bd 33.20-21 [TEXT X]):

And when the reign came to Yazdgird, he ruled for twenty years, then the Arabs rushed into Iran in large numbers: Yazdgird is not flowering⁶⁸ in the battle against them; he went to *XVarāšān* and *Turkešān* to ask there for support in horses and men, and they killed him there. The son of Yazdgird went to India and brought a large army; before its (the army's) arrival in *XVarāšān*, he went into exile and this large army was disturbed and the Iranian Realm remained in the hands of the Arabs ...

The impotence of Yazdgird and the abortive attempt of Yazdgird's son *Pērōz* to reconquer Iran⁶⁹, described with a sort of bitter criticism which still could be sensed in Bd 33.20-21, provoked, nevertheless, Messianic expectations (ZWY 7.7,14; 8.1 [TEXT XI]):

When the Kay will be thirty years of age ..., the armies with innumerable banners, the Indian and the Chinese armies having up-raised banners [for they will raise the banners aloft], having erect banners, having erect weapons, they will make razziahs upto *Wehrōd* ... For the support of the Iranian countries, there will be the innumerable troops of *XVarāšānians* having erect banners ... About *Wahrām ī Warzāwand* it is manifest that he will come forth with fullness of *xVarnah* ... he will re-establish these Iranian countries created by Me, *Ohrmazd*.

This is a combination made up of different sources at a late date (cf. below), while the Bd passages following those quoted above represent a slightly older version, though also of a composite character (Bd 33.24-27 [TEXT X]):

68 Or, "triumphant", *škrōhēd*, historical present.

69 For a *T'ang* account about the last decades of Sasanian Iran and *Pērōz's* activities, cf. Chavannes 1903, 170f., esp. p. 172.

"A multitude will come with red ensigns and red banners, and will seize *Pārs* and the districts of the Iranian Realm upto Babylon, and they will humiliate the Arabs. And then, from the direction of the East, one bad man will come; he drives away those of *Padīš xVārgār*; he will establish his wicked rule for several years ...

After that, the Turkish army will rush into the Iranian Realm in large numbers and with many banners, will desolate this prosperous and sweet-smelling Iranian Realm, will disturb many thriving families, will perpetrate much harm and violence to the men of the Iranian Realm, and will eradicate, disturb, and seize many mansions, until God will have mercy. And when the Byzantines will arrive and rule for a year, at that time, one will come from the frontiers of *Kābulēstān*, in whom there will be *xVarnah*, of the lordly family, whom they call *Kay Wahrām*, and all men will support him again, and he will rule even over India, Byzantium, *Turkešān*, over all the frontiers; he will remove all impious beliefs and having restored the Avesta / Religion of Zoroaster, no person will dare to come in public with any other belief".

ZWY 7-B treats the events of the 11th Zoroastrian century, that of the future Savior *Hōšēdar*. Two are preparing the coming of *Hōšēdar*: *Kay Wahrām* and *Pēšōtan* (compare Bd 33; Kippenberg 1978, 64). The history of the former is to be found in the Younger Avesta, where he appears as a mythological (pre-Zoroastrian?) divine royal hero. Already in the third century the name became popular among the members of later Sasanian dynasty; five Sasanian kings bore this name, from *Wahrām I*, 273-6, to *Wahrām V*, 421-439. This seems to reflect eschatological tensions of the approaching end of the Prophet's millennium; the Sasanian kings, who pretended to be of divine origin, began adding *Kai-* to their names⁷⁰.

The restoration of the older Iranian traditions as found in full in the *Sāh-Nāmah* was not only "the Iranian answer to the West"⁷¹, but also a part of the "system pressure", as exemplified, i.e., in arising of the codified "Sasanian Avesta", with the renewed interest in older traditions which naturally accompanied the process of the codification. If the figure of *Wahrām* in the apocalyptic fragments arose from remnants of the *Cōbēnian agitprop* (cf. Czeglédy 1957 and 1958) and under the impact of the flight of the last Sasanian prince to China, the figure of *Pēšōtan* (the priest who is the immortal son of the first Zoroastrian king), who will join forces with *Wahrām ī Warzāwand* to rescue Iran, should be seen, in the same apocalyptic fragments, in the context of the Late Sasanian political and religious situation⁷². We are told that

70 Sundermann 1992; Yarshater 1966.

71 Cf. *Sāhpuhr's* letters quoted above, compare Yarshater 1971; Bivar 1993.

72 I hope to treat this subject at length elsewhere.

then Mithra will fight Pēšōtan's battle against the demons who ruled a thousand years more than was allotted to them (these fragments describe the 11th century of the millennium); thus, being perhaps an indication that the text was arranged *after* the Sasanian period.

However, a thorough analysis of the passages enables us to date at least some of them, though for the most part the references to constant wars with the neighbors are not helpful.

Wahrām V Gōr fought Byzantines, Chionites and Hephthalites; Yazdgird II fought White Huns (Chionites and Hephthalites) and the Christian Armenians; Kawād I fought Byzantines and Huns; his son Xusraw I Anōšurwān fought Byzantines and Hephthalites, who were finally defeated by Turks and Xusraw *circa* 558-561; Ōhrmazd (Hormizd) IV fought Byzantines and Turks; then, of course, there came the revolt of Wahrām ī Cōbēn, the Crusher of the Turks, and the Byzantine invasion led by Maurice, who seized Armenia in 591 and gave her daughter Maria as wife to his *client*, Xusraw II. After Maurice's death, however, hostilities with Byzantium broke out again and it was Xusraw II who gained the most success against the Byzantines. However, in 623 Türküt-Khazars and the Byzantine armies of Heraclius invaded Iran. Under Xusraw II Parwēz (590-628) the Triumphant, the Third Iranian Empire almost reached the extent of the Empire of the Achæmenids, after this king conquered Jerusalem and Egypt (614) and was about to capture Constantinople (626); this seems to be the rule referred to in Dk 7.40ff. (on Caesar and Khagan) [TEXT XII]⁷³.

This king was killed as a result of a conspiracy which involved his own son, Šērōyē, who ruled for half a year as Kawād II. As the name Kawād is a shortened form of Kay Kawād, there is no doubt that the Kay of ZWY 7.6, "whose father's life will come to an end"⁷⁴, is no other but Šērōyē and "the father of the Kay" is Xusraw II Parwēz. Thus, ZWY 7.6 is to be dated by 628 CE⁷⁵.

In the following, it is stated that "they will bring *him* up with the maidens of the king"; to my opinion, a different monarch is meant here, not Šērōyē (whose rule was short-living), but his minor son Ardašēr III.

73 MX 21.25-6 refers to Sasanian-Byzantine wars (Tafazzoli 1992, 555): kū Anērth ī Hrōmīgān ud Türkānāz abāg ērānagān bē az hān kēn būd īšān pad ōzadan ī Eric kašt ud tā frašgird hamē paywandēd, "the cause of the Byzantine and Turkish enmity towards the Iranians is that they (the Byzantines and Turks) killed Eric; it will last until the Renovation", thus leaving a room for reconciliation.

74 Note the euphemism for patricide!

75 The gloss contains some chronological information: "in the month Abān on the day Wād".

Then, "a woman will be the ruler", obviously the Queen Bōrān, a daughter of the ill-fated Xusraw II Parwēz (less probably, her sister Azarmēduxt).

Thus, we have here traces of rather late redactions going back to the last decades of existence of Sasanian Iran. In ZWY 7.12 [TEXT X] we have, according to my interpretation, the references to battles against the invading Arab Muslims: in 636, the battles of al-Jir and Qādisīyah were fought, then the bloody battle at Jalūla⁷⁶ opened the way to the passes through Zagros, and the battle at Nihāwand that followed enabled the Arabs to penetrate the heart of the Iranian plateau.

Now we turn, in order to establish the scriptural sources of the eschatological fragments, to some terms typical for these texts. As to "uplifted", or "erect", "banners / standards", or "spears"⁷⁷, it is impossible to provide a more precise translation for the simple reason that in translations from Avestan, Pahlavi words may retain the meaning of their Avestan etymon, their "dictionary value" thus being different from that used elsewhere. The original text in which the notion had its origin seems to be the Tīr Yašt (Yt 8.56) [TEXT XIII], with its uzgaraptō drašō; unfortunately, we do not possess a Pahlavi version of this text. Yt 1.11 (Ōhrmazd Yašt, being a secondary text) [TEXT XIVa] elaborated the notion taken, supposedly, from Yt 8.56: pərəθu.drašāiia ērəwō.drašāiia uzgaraptō.drašāiia xurām drašām barəntaiia, "with many spears, with the straight spears/standards, with the spears/standards uplifted, bearing the spears/standards of blood".

Here *ērəwō.drašāiia* *uzgaraptō.drašāiia* are used as synonymous⁷⁸ terms ("straight/uplifted"). The Pahlavi version of Ōhrmazd Yašt has non-etymological stēndag draš for *ērəwō.drašā* and etymological ul grift draš for *uz[a]garaptō.drašā*. One may be almost sure that the source of the notion in our extant Pahlavi texts was *not* the Srōš Yašt, where similar expressions appear twice, for the reason that the Pahlavi versions of these passages are different. Y 57.16 has yō vīspam ahūm *ērəwā snaiēiā* nipāiti, Pahlavi: kē harwisp axV ī astōmand *abrast*⁷⁹ *sneh* bē pāyēd [kū sneh ēw

76 The restoration in the text is mine.

77 "Banners" (dgl) appear already in Elephantine Aramaic Papyri; "banners" were important in the cult of Hatra (smyt³) and still are in the Mandæan religion (drašā).

78 As etymons of the Avestan *ērəwā*, AiW 351 quoted two Ossetic forms, *urđg*, *urđag*, "Steilweg". This etymology is correct: урдыг: "крутой склон, уклон, отвес"; урдыг лъуууы, "стоять прямо".

79 In Phlvd 1.6 the same word is the epithet of Bactria "with erect banners" (Bāxōt *abrast* *draš*).

abrāst], "this one who protects the entire corporeal existence with upraised weapon [i.e., he raised a weapon]".

Y 57.25 has nō ... nīpaliā ... pairi drvatai aēsmāi pairi *drvaibiiō
 *haēnābiiō yā us xruēm drafšam garəwnən aēsmahē parō draomābiiō yā
 aēsmō duždā dravaiiāi mai viōātaoi daēuō.dātāt,
 "may you protect us ... from the wicked Wrath, from the wicked armies which raise the
 bloodstained standard, from the deceptions of Wrath, which the malignant Wrath causes, together
 with the demon-created viōātu"⁸⁰.

This is rendered by the Pahlavi version as follows:

... amān bē payē ... bē az awē druwand xēsm bē az awē druwand hēn [ī
 dušman] kē pad ulīh *xruwīg⁸¹ drafš navēd pad pēšōbāyīh ī xēsm ūšān
 xēsm ī duž.dānāg dāred ūšān abāg wtdād ī dēwān.dād,

"... may you protect us ... from the wicked xēsm, from the wicked army [the hostile], which
 leads aloft the bloody standard under the leadership of xēsm; xēsm, the ignorant, keeps them
 and the demons-created wtdād is with them"⁸².

As one can see, pad ulīh *xruwīg drafš navēd is a far cry from ul grift drafš,
 though it should be noted that the choice of *nīdan, nay- for the Avestan us ... garəwnən
 seems surprising (*ul griftan, grī- is expected). As to us xruēm drafšam
 garəwnən, "which raise the bloodstained standard", it has its parallel in Yt 1.11 with its
 xruēm drafšam barantāia, "bearing the spears/standards of blood", which comes
 immediately after "with the spears/standards uplifted" (uzaqarəptō. drafšāia).

⁸⁰ This translation is based on Kreyenbroek 1985, 51; the translation of the almost identical passage found in the Mihr-Yašt (Yt 10.93) given in Gershevitch 1967, 119, is different on several points.

⁸¹ The hapax *xruwīg (for xruēm, related to Slavic words for "blood") is almost unattested in the MS tradition, cf. Dhabhar 1927, 117.3 n. 13; Dhabhar 1963, 219-220, nn. 5-6; Kreyenbroek 1985, 91 n. 25.7.

⁸² This translation is, basically, adopted from Kreyenbroek 1985, 51, 53.

This Avestan xruēm drafšam barantāia was rendered, with right, as kē pad
wixrōnīh drafš barēnd [pad rēš kardan ō mardomān], "who carry the banners with
 bloodshed [with wounding people]" (Avestan xru- is always rendered by wixrōnīh and glossed
 rēš, cf. Schwartz 1982; cmp. AiW 539). The expression xruēm drafša (Y 57.25, Yt 1.11;
 AiW 539), "bloody standard / spear" seems to be a Late Avestan misinterpretation of an older
 Avestan term. This is the Yaštic expression xrvf. drav- (AiW 540), "with a bloody club"⁸³,
 a frequent epithet of Xēšm; as to semantics, "spear", besides "standard / banner" of drafša
 (standards were tied up to spears), is fairly close in meaning to "club". In Pahlavi *Zands*
 xrvf. drav- was transcribed as huwīdlwš or huldīpš (read: xrwīdruš or xurdruš, cf.
 MacKenzie 1971, 94), with the second spelling demonstrating that the term was sometimes
 analyzed in Pahlavi as containing the word for "banner / spear", not for "club".

Later, it was misinterpreted as *ul.drafš, "with raised banner" (MacKenzie 1971, 94),
 and ul grift drafš became used beside xrwīdruš / xurdruš (compare ZWY 7.18, 7.26
 [TEXT X], ZWY 4.26 [TEXT XV] for xrwīdruš / xurdruš and ZWY 6.6 [TEXT XVI], ZWY 7.7
 [TEXT X] for drafš ul grīrēnd⁸⁴). The contexts like the quoted above us [=ul] xruēm
 drafšam garəwnən [=*grīrēnd] demonstrate how easily this could be misinterpreted.

The Sītjūdgar Nask of the Sasanian Avesta contained mostly *midrashic* interpretation of
 the Pahlavi version of the Gāthā; a shortened version of the Kamnamēz fragard of the
 Sītjūdgar Nask still survives as Dk 9.16 (DkM 803-6). There one finds (DkM 805.9),
 among other motifs unsupported by the extant PY, a description of the mythical fortress
 Kangdiz located somewhere in the Iranian East (Dk 9.16.15)⁸⁵ [TEXT XVII]. In this Late
 Sasanian version, serious mistakes were made by compiler[s] of redactor[s], who, in my opinion
 (cf. my notes there) misunderstood *stēndag drafš of their *Zand* original which goes back to
 Avestan *arəōwō drafša, and created "Kangdiz of hundred merlons / pinnacles AND a myriad
 banners / spears".

⁸³ It is of interest that Abu Mislīm's (Bihzādān b. Windād-Hurmuzd, according to Ibn al-Aṭīr)
 partisans, donned in black, referred to their wooden clubs as "infidel-fellers", cf. Zamīnkūb 1975, 53.

⁸⁴ Quotations with similar meanings were drawn together in ZWY: compare abrāstag.zēn in ZWY 7.7,
 from PY 57.16 (abrāst sneh [Kū sneh ēw abrāst]), found in ZWY in the same passage with drafš
 ul grīrēnd, or abrāstag.drafš in the same passage (ZWY 7.7) and in ZWY 7.14 (from PhIVd 1.6,
 where the same expression is used as the epithet of Bactria?).

⁸⁵ This Dk passage and ZWY 7.28 go back to the same source.

In my opinion (and it seems to be also the opinion of Tafazzoli 1971, 199-200, though his interpretation there is different - he emended the text in order to make it to correspond to PhlYt 1.11 [TEXT XIV]), this Dēnkard passage goes back directly to the Pahlavi version of Yt 1.11. It should be also noted that the compiler did not realize that his source contains a passage derived from PhlYt 1.11 (a much read text); he was not aware of parallels such as PhlVd 1.6 (which is even more frequently read).

Zands were used to demonize the adversaries of Iran and her rulers, as well as to provide consolation in times of hardship. In ZWY 6.3,5-6 we have mentioned together Sēdāsp, upraised standards / spears (drafš ul gīrēnd), KelesiyāgTh. Sēdāsp (which appears in Dk 7.8.47 [TEXT XVIII]; ZWY 6.3,5,6 [TEXT XVI]; 7.11 [TEXT XI]) seems to be an Avesticism⁸⁶, but it denotes unvariably Christian Byzantines⁸⁷; the term KelesiyāgTh (the reading of Cereti 1995 is Kilisāyīg) denotes the same⁸⁸, as is evident from the gloss quoted in the name of Māhwindād (Māhwindād guft kū hrōmāyīg bawēnd); Byzantines were actually called "Romans" by the Sasanian Iranians and by many other nations, and so was their self-designation, too. It was not until Heraclius⁸⁹, the last Byzantine contemporary of the Sasanians, that the Hellenic elements began to emerge back in Byzantium⁹⁰.

⁸⁶ On this term cf. also Widengren 1983, 116.

⁸⁷ West 1897, 104 n.4, thought the word in question "is probably a corrupt pronunciation of the name of some Byzantine emperor or general (such as Theodosius)...". Widengren 1971, 116, wrote about the term in question: "Der Name Sēdāsp ist aus der nationalen Überlieferung bekannt, wo er mit einer Abstammung von Tūr eingeführt wird. Die abstract-kollektive Form Sēdāspīh bedeutet wörtlich "die Sēdāspenschaft"... Der Name ist unbedingt avestisch, höchstwahrscheinlich *Xšāetāspā, "glänzende Rosse habend". I accept the opinion of Widengren, adding that an Aramaeo-Iranian popular etymology perhaps also took place: Aramaic šēdā, "demon", was known in Iran (New Persian *šā'idā*, "mad with love, demon", Kurdish *šēt* / *pelerī*, "teuflisch"), and it would be plausible to suggest the possibility of an interpretation of Sēdāsp as *šēdā, "demon", + asp, "horse". If so, this usage of the term must be dated only after the shift of t to d in an intervocalic position, namely, close to the end of the Sasanian epoch. As Sēdāsp was applied, for some reason, only to Byzantines, the supposed demonic semantics of this word overlapped with other terms for alien invaders, such as "those with dishevelled hairs", wīzārd.wars, buland pēšag, "riders", in Dk 8.8.2 must stand for Sēdāsp.

⁸⁸ As to this term, one may think of *εκκληρία, ἐκκλησιαστικοί, cf. New Persian (via Aramaica?) kalīšā (cf. Darmesteter 1883, 69, 335 n. 4); kīsy'k was compared by Darmesteter 1892-3, I, 80-83 etc., and by Nyberg 1929, 53, also to Avestan Karasānay- of Hōm Yašt (Y 9.24; cf. AIW 470). On this term cf. also Widengren 1983, 116; Kreyenbroek 1983, 101-2 n. 6.10.

⁸⁹ Heraclius was the first Byzantine emperor who gave up the Latin title *imperator* and accepted instead of it the Greek βασιλεύς, also adopting, for the first time, Greek as an official language.

⁹⁰ In Pahlavi texts, Alexander was always seen as hrōmāyīg, "Roman", i.e., Byzantine Greek. Even later, the Ottoman Turks were called *Rūmī* by Central Asian and Indian Muslims. Much later, Mustafā Kemāl Atatürk considered for a while *Rūmī Türk* as the self-definition for the Anatolian citizens of the Republic.

These "Avesticized" enemies are said to be "the army of these dēws with dishevelled hair ..., the army having the wide front of the Turks and the Karmīr enemy [know that they will have a high banner, for they will hold the banner up ...], the leathern-belted Turks and the Sēdāspian and Kelesiyāgīan Byzantines" (spāh ī awēšān dēwān ī wīzārd.warsān ... hēn ī frāxv.anīg].dušmen, Turk [ī] Karmīr. [hād ul drafš, hēnd, cē drafš ul gīrēnd ...]. Turk ī duwāl kustīg, Hrōmāyīg, Sēdāspīhā ī Kelesiyāgīhā, ZWY 6.6), "the army with the wide front of the two-legged creatures of wolves and the leathern-belted dēws" (hēn ī frāx. anīg ud dām ī gurg ī dō zang ud dēw ī dawāl kūstīg, ZWY 7.11); the enemies of Iran are described in ZWY 1.11, 3.29 and 4.3 as dēwān ī wīzārd.wars ī xēšm.tōhmag, "demons with dishevelled hairs, of the seed of xēšm".

The expression xēšm.tōhmag has a long history in the apocalyptic tradition of the Eastern Mediterranean, and is ultimately an Iranian motif (cf. Pines 1982⁹¹); the idea that these demonic invaders have "dishevelled hairs", wīzārd.wars, goes back to the *mairya*-bands of pre-Zoroastrian paganism, whose threatening image later on has been strengthened by the image of the Turk. This expression is used in ZWY 1.11, 3.29, 4.3, 4, 10, 26; 6.1, 6; the eschatological invaders are designated as "leathern-belted" in ZWY 4.59, 6.6, 7.32, an expression that had perhaps some roots in the historical reality; however, it was used also in the Egyptian "Potter's Oracle", being there, in all probability, an Iranian import. The expression used in ZWY 6.6, 7.11 the army having the wide front of the Turks and the Karmīr (hēn ī frāxv.anīg dušmen, Turk) goes back to PhlYt 1.11: "the army with the wide front [the enemies whose land is vast; there is some one who says: "frāxvānīg, with the wide front" means they have wide foreheads, being the Tūrānīan Turks] (hēnāz ī frāxvānīg [dušman būmāšān frāxv. hast kē gōwēd ēd frāxvānīg kūšān pēšānīg frāxv Turk ī Tūrīg]), where the later gloss refers to the racial characteristics of Turks equated with the Avestan Tūrānians.

In Dk 7.8 different chronological layers can be traced: Dk 7.8.2 [TEXT XIX] ascribed to Byzantines "with dishevelled hairs" (wīzārd.wars) "the transfer of the Iranian royalty from Iran, the disturbance of law, custom, rite" (hanjafīšn ī Erān.xVadāyīn az Erān.šāhr, wīšōbišn ī dād, ēwēn, ristag); the most important features of this passage are:

⁹¹ The idea that the demonic *Race of Wrath* is of a miscarriage nature is clearly Iranian. In Manichaeism, one has to emphasize the Iranian aspect of the teaching about the *Fallen Angels*; the Judaeo-Christian material [ultimately going back to Iran] is less clear-cut in this respect.

- 1) the designation of the Byzantines as *Krisyānīg*, closer to *Χριστιαν-* /جسعیان and, supposedly, an older form than *Kelesiyāgīh*;
- 2) dating of this event by "the ninth and the tenth centuries", not by the eleventh century, as in the ZWY *Pēšōtan* fragments;
- 3) these events are taking place in "the now visible circumstances" (*hān ī nūn wēnābdāg ēdōnīh*);
- 4) it is stated that these events are prophetically (*pēš.kēdīgīhā*) predicted in the Avesta.

Thus, this passage can be dated by the last decades of the Sasanian Empire. Another passage, connected with the one quoted above, is Dk 7.8.40-43 [TEXT XII]. This passage, too, speaks of "passing over of the authority from the wicked ones of all the periods" (in this context, it is unclear whether "the wicked ones" are alien enemies or evil *Iranian* rulers); the text, however, clearly identifies the Avestan "*kēk* and *karap* who are the most evil rulers in authority" (we will turn to this expression later) with "those who are in power ... people such as the Caesar and the Khagan". No doubt, the events of mid-620s are referred to. In contrast, Yt 11.6 [TEXT XX] seems to belong to an earlier date, as it refers to Byzantines only. Dk 7.8.47 [TEXT XVIII] belongs to a slightly later date than Dk 7.8.40-43 [TEXT XII], as it speaks of "Turkic demons with dishevelled hairs, Arabs, and also the *Christian *Byzantine *Sēdāsp*" (Turk *dēwīthaz ī wīzārd.wars Tāzīg ud Sēdāspaz ī Kilislyāg Hrōm[āy]īg*).

Though Dk 7.8.40-43, with its political actuality, could be easily seen as a piece of propaganda, nevertheless, it is based on a Pahlavi re-working of a lost *midrashic* commentary to Y 32. Another text based on the same lost *Zand* is Dk 9.32 (*Waršmansār Nask*) (another echo is to be found in Dk 8.35.13). Dk 9.32.23 [TEXT XXI] is a combination derived from PY 32.14a & 15a [TEXTS XXII & 7 XXIII] (an old *Zand* of these passages is preserved also in Dk 7.8.26 [TEXT XXIV]. theme of Dk 9.32.23 is "transfer of sovereignty, whose rulers are the *kēks* and *karaps*, they who are the worst rulers in the land", cf. also Dk 9.31.18, Dk 7.9.23. *Kēks* and *Karaps* are Pahlavi forms of older Iranian terms, which underwent the process of demonization in the Zoroastrian parlance. *Kēk* continues Old Iranian and Old Indic *kavi-* and is connected to Lycian *kave-* "priest", Hittite *mukawar*, *mukessar*, "prayer", from *mugāi* "to pray", Carian *mukovor*, Lycian *mukssa*, while the root of the word *Karapan-* survived in *Khwarazmian* (*karb-* "to moan, mumble"; "jammern, stöhnen") until the Muslim epoch

(cf. Henning 1951, 45; Mahlagha Samadi 1986, 103; Schwartz 1970, 391), as *mā karba* "don't talk nonsense!", *karbīda*, "go on moaning (mumbling)", in a religious context (of Koran reciting).

Though the general sense of Y 32.15a was grasped by the *Zandists*, their translation was based on the similarity of sound between unconnected Avestan and Pahlavi words; it was probably *vi.nānāsā* in this verse, rendered as *an.bēn*, "non-seeing, sightless", that aroused the equation of *kēk* ud *karap* with *karr* ud *kōr*, "deaf and blind": in PY 32.14a [TEXT XXII], Dk 7.8.60=Dk 7.9.23 [TEXT XXV], Phlyt 1.10 [TEXT XXVib], *kēks* and *karaps* are glossed as "those who are deaf and blind in the things of God" (*pād ciš ī Yazdān karr ud kōr*). The term was widely used by Sasanian Iranian for people whom they saw as wicked rulers and evil "non-orthodox" or non-Zoroastrian priests⁹². The edict issued in the fifth century by Mihr-Narsēh, the Sasanian prime-minister under Yazdgird II, and quoted by the Armenian author Erišē ("The War of Vartan", Erevan edition, p. 24) stated: "every man who does not follow the Mazda-worshipping Religion is deaf, blind and deceived by Ahriman's *dēws*" (*oč ouni zaurēns deni mazdesn na xoul ē ew koir ew divac haramanoi xabeal*, where Armenian *xoul ew koir* corresponds to Pahlavi *karr ud kōr*, cf. Russell 1987a, 136 n. 90-90a).

Now we turn to a late Pahlavi text of a post-Sasanian date known as "*Sāh Wahrām ī Warzāw and*", which continues and develops, in an interesting form, many of the motifs studied above. The text is extant now in two different versions both containing numerous interpolations and glosses. It should be noted that from the linguistic point of view, the text is in New Persian⁹³ rather than in Pahlavi proper. One version was edited and translated in Blochet 1895, 241-3, 1-3; another version was edited in Jamasp-Asana 1897, 160-1 and Bailey 1943, 195f.; it was treated in de Menasce 1947, cf. also Tafazzoli 1975⁹⁴; the poetic character of the text was treated in Nyberg 1928; Benveniste 1930; Henning 1942 (1944); Henning 1949-50; Tavadia 1950; Tavadia 1955 (who noted that the text is a poem with rhyme), Boyce 1954; Tafazzoli

92 Cf., e.g., Dk 7.8.30: *kōr awēšān druz hēnd kē ō tō ham.pursēnd ud anāgah sāsār, ud wēnāg awēšān druz hēnd kē ō awēšān ham.pursēnd, āgahīh menēnd ud anāgah hēnd ahlamōy ...*, "blind are these *druz*-demons who inquire you, and ignorant tyrants (they are), and even those are seeing *druz*-demons, who confer with them, they meditate (about) knowledge, but they are ignorant heretics ...".

93 Judging from its New Persian vocabulary which includes even some Arabic words; similarity was found with the text published by Henning 1950, 647ff.

94 *Non vidi* Jamasp-Asana *Madressa Jubilee Volume*, 75ff.

1350h.š. (1971); Tafazzoli 1972; Uta 1975, 406; Shaked 1969 (1970); Shaked 1980 text XXI; Shaked 1984, 58 n. 38; Lazard 1985.

The text blends prophecies concerning the God of Victory with the tales of the heroic Wahrām ī Cōbēn⁹⁵, and with the expectations for the coming of a restorer of the Sasanian Empire. It was stated that the old Iranian Yazata Wahrām was elevated in the Late Sasanian period to the status of the seventh Aməša Spənta (cf. de Menasce 1947, Dumézil 1970, 119 n. 11); indeed, the only Yazata mentioned in the entire Nām Stāyīšn prayer is Wahrām invoked together with Ohrmazd⁹⁶. The name Wahrām, popular, as was mentioned above, among the members of the Sasanian dynasty and nobility, was, as well, the name of Wahrām ī Cōbēn, the only person in the whole Sasanian period who dared insolently, claiming to Arsacid ancestry, to proclaim himself king. Passing as a legitimate sovereign, Wahrām ī Cōbēn should possess the Royal (Kayānian) xVarnah; there existed a considerable body of Cōbēnian propaganda⁹⁷ whose remnants were studied in Czeplédy 1957 & 1958. The memory of such claims was so well preserved much longer than even the location in which the last battle between Wahrām ī Cōbēn and Xusraw's Byzantine allies took place was called "Wild-Boar (warāz) River" or "The River of Wahrām"⁹⁸, warāz being a carrier of xVarnah (a hint to Wahrām ī Cōbēn's claims). Another story emphasizing the royal destiny of Wahrām ī Cōbēn was told in the 6th century and re-told in the Sāh Nāmāh⁹⁹ and in Nihāyat-i-irab¹⁰⁰, on king's encounter with his daēna. The onager (gōr) in the story represents the royal xVarnah¹⁰¹, while the Mōbadān-Mōbad who opposes Wahrām ī Cōbēn explains the gōr as dēw, instead of xVarnah, and the girl as "a spirit bearing the name daēna".

The beginning of both versions of the "Coming of King Wahrām" is almost identical:

95 Cf. Boyce 1968, 50.

96 Cf. Russell 1991, 3.

97 This practice, as other things seen by us now as Iranian, perhaps goes back to the Seleucids times; cf. Bickerman 1938, 123.

98 Cf. Minorsky 1943/6, 247.

99 Moscow VII, 399-405 (esp. v.1494), cf. Shahbazi 1986, 169-170.

100 Cf. Brown 1900, 237. What is amazing is the fact that the story has more in common with Kirdēr's account than with the Hāzōxt Nask.

101 As in another composition, namely in KNP 2, which is the very close in time; it is possible that the KNP passage in question was influenced by the tradition about Wahrām ī Cōbēn.

Abar madan ī Sāh ī Wahrām

kā bawād kā payg ēw āyēd az Hindūgān kā mad hān ī Sāh Wahrām az dōd[ag
1] Kayān kē pīl hast hazār ud abar sarān hast pīlbān¹⁰² kē ārastag¹⁰³
drafš dāred¹⁰⁴ pad ēwēn ī Husrawān¹⁰⁵ pēš laškar¹⁰⁶ barēnd¹⁰⁷, 108 pad
spāh.sardārān mard ēw bašīr¹⁰⁹ abāyēd kardan zīrag turgamān¹¹⁰.

102 Blochet has pērōzān, "victorious", as a variant. It might refer to the supporters of Pērōz son of Yazdgerd III, who was put on the throne in 661 for a short period by the dehqāns of Toxarestān, the Chinese Po-su, "Persia". The area of Toxarestān / Kābulestān was regarded by the Sasanians as "India", but at that period it was a Chinese frontier region, hence the confusion between the terms "India" and "China".

103 As Blochet 1895, 241 n. 2, correctly noted, this word is a rendering of the Avestan arəwō.drafsā, "with elevated standards", cf. also AiW 351a Vd 1.6 (on Balx), the version is as here), Yt 1.11. However, the general rendering of the Avestan word in question in ZWY is ul.grift drafš, and it is only here and in Vd 1.6 that we have an attempt of etymological Zand - translation (arəw / ārast). This usage was provoked by the mention of Balx in the Vd locus, as Balx was the last stand of the Iranian Resistance, until the city was finally captured in 707.

104 Treated also in Tafazzoli 1975, 397.

105 Cf. my translation. There is no need to presuppose the impact of the Arabic kisrā[y], as the lemma xusraw was used also in the Mazdakite source of Sahrastānī where it could not mean "Chosroes", but merely "king". Indeed, Blochet's text has here šīrd'r'n, šahrīyārān.

106 Blochet: spāh.

107 Blochet: abar barēnd.

108 Blochet has here: andar (andarōn?) purr? ...grān mardag-ēw abāyēd kardan, translated: "C'est alors qu'il faudra faire acte de vaillance au milieu du combat". The apparatus of "Pahlavi Texts" has no note here.

109 Bailey 1943, 195 n. 1: Arabic *bašīr; however, *bašīr is also possible.

110 Bailey 1943, 195 n. 1: Syriac trgm., "interpreter", hence Arabic*turjumān; DkM 48.20. Blochet's text is corrupt: mardag-ēw (mīdky against GBL? of "Pahlavi Texts") abāyēd kardan dānāg ud hōšōmand; but, as in the case of šahrīyārān/šahrīyārān which explains the correct sense of xusrawān, Blochet's dānāg points in the direction of the Arabic bašīr, rather than bašīr, and hōšōmand is a fair substitute for turgamān.

On the Coming of King Wahrām

When will it be that a courier will come from India, saying that the Sāh Wahrām of the Kayānian family has come¹¹¹, having a thousand elephants, with an elephant-keeper upon each of their heads, who bears the raised standard. They bear it before the army in the manner of the Sasanian Kings¹¹². To the generals a messenger / a wise man is needed, a skilled interpreter¹¹³.

¹¹¹ A reference to Zoroastrians in India is found in *AyJ* 8.4-5. Among the Parsees, some expectations of the coming of Wahrām from India to liberate Iran from the Islamic grasp are current until this very day.

¹¹² Cf. *ZWY* 7.10, below, and my note there.

¹¹³ We know that the Seleucids used interpreters in their multi-ethnic armies, cf. Bickerman 1938, 83;

it is not impossible that the Arsacids and the Sasanians preserved this practice.

So far the two texts were basically identical. It is here that the differences begin - the version of "Pahlavi Texts" reads:

kā šawēd bē gōwēd pad Hindūgān *kū amāh cē dīd az dast ī Tāzīgān abar ewag grōh¹¹⁴.

When he comes, he will tell in India in one crowd / army what we have seen from the hand / from the power of the Arabs.

Bloch's version is very different:

kā šawēd bē ^ō¹¹⁵ Hindūgān gōwēd kū amāh cē šahrīyārān amāh abāg Tāzīgān ud Tūrānīg ud Hrōm ud Cīnestān ud dēwān ī Māzēnīgān kārezār abar burd *hēm¹¹⁶, kē awēšān az stōwīh Dēn ī weh ud abēzag ud parastišn ī Yazdān ud Amahraspandān ud āta(x)š ī suxr [ud] sōza[g] padīrift hēnd. ud az zamān ī anōšag-ruwān Zardu(x)št ī Spitāmān Dēn ī abēzag tā 1000 sāl rawāgīh sāzēd. ud nūnaz Tāzīgān ī mošx^vār kē xōy ud xēm ī mār dārēnd...

When he comes, he will tell in India, saying: "We¹¹⁷, who are the ruler, We fought the Arabs, the Turks, Byzantium, China¹¹⁸ and the demons of Māzandarān, (so) that they, having been overcome, accepted the Pure Good Religion and the worship of the Yazatas and the Holy Immortals and the red blazen Fire". And from the time of Spitāmān Zoroaster of Immortal Soul¹¹⁹ the Pure Religion was current about 1000 years, but now, the mice-eating Arabs, who have character and nature of demons...

¹¹⁴ Cf. *Bd* 33.24: grōh āyēnd suxr.nišān ud suxr.drafš ud Pārs ud rōstāgīhā ī Erān.šahr tā Bābīl gīrēnd ud awēšān Tāzīgān nīzār kunēnd, "a multitude will come with red ensigns and red banners, and will seize Pārs and the districts of the Iranian Realm upto Babylon, and they will humiliate the Arabs".

¹¹⁵ Instead of *pad*. A form current in Early New Persian, cf. Shaked 1986a.

¹¹⁶ The text has hēnd.

¹¹⁷ Pluralis majestatis.

¹¹⁸ Central Asia, cf. Blochet 1895, 241 n. 6.

¹¹⁹ On the meaning, cf. Brunner in *Encir* II, 98-99.

The Māzandarān dēws are mentioned in a similar context also in Dk 9.21. In my opinion, one of the reasons why they are referred to here is that this text was composed in Ṭabarastān, one of the last strongholds of Iranian resistance, near Māzandarān. Māzainīā¹²⁰ daēvā, the *druz*-adherents of Varāna¹²¹ (cf. Yt 5.22, Yt 5.33, Vd 1.17¹²²), were frowned upon with such a mystical fear that it was in their land that the White Dēw of Māzandarān was placed¹²³. Occurring outside the Sāh-Nāmāh also in the Mediaeval Armenian Sasun Epic¹²⁴, this *daimon* must be a blurred reminiscence of the pre-Iranian "Aryan" divinity; dēw meant, of course, "god", and its appellative, spēd, means in Iranian, and, especially, in Armenian¹²⁵, "bright, luminous"¹²⁶. Thus, spēd must be a rendering of the older name, *Dyaus Asura or the like.

Besides these mythical considerations, the reason for grouping together of the Arabs, Turks, Byzantines, Central Asian tribes adjunct to China and the demons of Māzandarān as the enemies of Iran might be simply the fact that all these were associated with exploits of Wahrām Ṭ Cōbēn. In 588 (589?) Wahrām crossed the Oxus and killed the Turkic king. After his victory, Wahrām Ṭ Cōbēn was sent to the Caucasus to repel the invading Khazars¹²⁷. He was successful and opened hostilities against the Byzantines in Georgia¹²⁸. After his defeat on the banks of the Araxes, Hormizd (Ohrmazd) IV decided to remove him, but Wahrām answered with a revolt. This is the short epoch when wars were waged almost simultaneously with Turks,

120 From māsa-, "big", > Māzandarān, dara, "ravine", Bailey 1979, 115. Perhaps the name of Medes [Māda-] is connected to Māzana-.

121 Indic Varuṇ, Ōaortow > Pahlavi Varan, demon of concupiscence, Burrow 1973, 135.

122 Cf. Henning 1947-8, 52-3.

123 On which cf. Nöldeke 1904.

124 Cf. Russell 1998.

125 Being associated with angels, etc.; Prof. J.R. Russell, an oral communication.

126 Compare *Dyaus, θεός, Zeus etc., on the one hand, and Yima xsāēta-, "luminous, shining", on the other.

127 On this invasion as reflected already in the Xwadāy Nāmāg, cf. Nöldeke 270 (Tajārib al-Umam i, 219.7); Czeglédy 1958; Biró 1979, 177. It can be, nevertheless, an anachronism, as it seems that no Khazars were yet around to invade. This topic cannot be dealt with here at length. It should be noted in passing that Bailey suggested two different emendations of a problematic word in ZWY 4.58; Bailey 1930-32c, 946: HPTL, "Hepthalites"; but Bailey 1943a, 1ff.: HGL, "Khazars"; cf. also Henning 1952, 505 n. 2 and Bailey 1954, 21. The most recent editor of ZWY read the word in question *Xadur* (cf. the comments in Cereti 1995, 192).

128 On his activities in Georgia, cf. Biró 1979.

Khazars (?), Byzantines and Arabs. Bearing in mind the Caucasian connection of Wahrām's activities, the demons of Māzandarān could be perhaps identifiable with Georgians, Caucasian Albanians or with other Caucasian peoples (or "Türküts").

Further, Blochet's text has:

ciyōn sag xVarēnd nān¹²⁹ bē stad hēnd pādixšāyīh az Xusrawān.
nē pad hunar ud nē pad mardīh ud nē pad zōr ī xrad, be pad afsōs ud bē *an-
āṭn stad hēnd,

Like dogs they eat the bread. They have taken away the sovereignty from the *Sasanians. Not by skill, not valor, not by the power of wisdom, but in mockery and injustice have they taken it,

while the version of "Pahlavi Texts" reads:

Dēn nīzār kard ud bē *ōzad šāhān šāh ciyōn sag xVarēnd nān. bē stad hēnd
pādixšāyīh ī az Xusrawān. nē pad hunar, nē pad mardīh, bē pad afsōs ud
riyāhrīh¹³⁰ bē stad hēnd,

The Religion was ruined and the King of Kings slain like a dog¹³¹. They eat the bread¹³². They have taken away the sovereignty from the *Sasanians. Not by skill and valor, but in mockery and scorn have they taken it.

129 LHMA.

130 Henning 1937, 87: Parthian *ryl*, "haughtiness, scorn".

131 Cf. Bd 33.20.

132 As the Russian traveller of the mid-19th century Khanykoff has noted, in Māzandarān eating of bread was regarded as abomination. This may indicate the Ṭabarastān provenance of our text, as Ṭabarastān was one of the last strongholds of the Iranian Resistance. On the other hand, Zoroastrian Persian ōm-e šwa, Gujarati kuṭṭā-nō bŭk, "portion of the dog", consists of bread, as "for Iranians bread had long replaced meat as the staple of diet", cf. Boyce 1996, 468b, and bread is put on or by the corpse, to be eaten by the dog. It is not impossible that "they eat bread" is merely a gloss provoked by the word "dog", as "dogs" in Iranian speech are frequently evoked together with "bread". Cf. Šad-dar naēr, ed. Dhabhar, p. 24 (*non vidī*), quoted in Bailey 1943, 165:

kašī ki Avastā biyāmōxta būdi wa a yād bāz kardī tā āngahi ki dīgar bar zi bar kardī ūrā nān čināncī bi-sagān dihand dādandī wa jāy ī dīgar xwānda am ki nān sar ī nīza bad-ū dādandī, "the person who had learned the Avesta and forgotten it, till the time that he had memorized it again, they gave bread to him as they give it to dogs. In another place I have read, that they gave him bread on the tip of a spear".

However, it is of interest that Blochet translated "un morceau de viande" (Arabic *īahm, rather than Aramaic *īahmā). As to the knowledge of the real reading of LHMA, cf. the well-known Arabic passage on Huzwārīn given in Schäfer 1932, I, 207.

The version of "Pahlavi Texts" goes further:

gīrēnd pad stahmb az mardomān zan ud xVāstagīhā ī šīrēn, bāy, bōyestān. gazīdag¹³³ abar nihād hēnd, bē dāxt hēnd abar sarān abāz aslī[k]¹³⁴ xVāst hēnd sāg ī grān. bē nigēr ka čand wad abgand hān druz pad ēn gēhān, ka nēst wattar az awē wad. gēhān az amāh bē āyēd,

By force they take from men wives and sweet possessions, parks and gardens. They have imposed taxes, they have distributed them upon the heads. They have demanded again the principal, a heavy impost. Consider how much evil those wicked ones have cast upon this world, so that there is none worse than this evil. The world passes from us.

Bloch's version reads:

ce hēč kas pad ēn ēwēn pad stahmag nē stad ēstēd ud ciyōn dēw.kēš dārēnd ud dēw.pēšag kē dād ī wad.tar pad gēhān āšākārtar ud wehīh ud dād ī frārōnīh azēr zamīg nihān kard hēnd. ud pad kār ī wināh.kārīh čēr ud dōšāramīh pad wināh.kārān weh kunēnd ud bēm ī dōšax^v ud pādīfrāh andar dil nē dārēnd ud rōspīg ud rōspīg-bāragīh¹³⁵ andar awēšān was hast. ud Dēn ī abēzag ud kār.kirbag ud dād ī xVarr[ah] nērang.guftārīh ud kēn.menīšnīh ud afsōs[īh] ud riyahrīh ud stahmbagīh āškār būd hast,

That nobody captured [an empire] by such kind of tyranny. They have a demonic creed and a demonic conduct, they spread in the world a more evil faith and they conceal under the earth the good¹³⁶ and the Pious Faith. They are eager to perform sins and they love evil-doers very much, they have not in their hearts any fear of Hell and Retribution, and prostitution and sodomy are current among them. And they spread spell-casting, envy, mockery, scorn and tyranny [against] the Pure Religion and the merits and the Faith of Glory.

¹³³ The word is Iranian, being a borrowing into Arabic; on this word, cf. Weryho 1971. Arabic *ǧīzyat*-, Syriac *gāzītā*, Firdausi's *gāzīt*/t.

¹³⁴ Arabic > New Persian *māl* ī *pašī*; on the expression cf. Jamasp-Asana 1897, 160; Bailey 1943, 195, differently Tavadia 1955, 36 n. 32; Shaked 1970, 405 n. 37; Gil & Shaked 1986, 820.

¹³⁵ In passing, it could be noted that this Pahlavi expression is typical also for a Judaeo-Persian apocalyptic text *Qisṣah-i Daniel*, edited and translated in Zotenberg 1869 and in Darmesteter 1887; cf. now Shapira 1999. Compare ZWY 4.63.

¹³⁶ An interference with the Frāšyāb tradition.

It is how the version of the "Pahlavi Texts" comes to its end:

hān Sāh Wahrām ī warzāwand az dūdag ī Kayān bē awarēm kēn ī Tāzīgān ciyōn Rōstahm¹³⁷ āwurd gurz kēn ī gēhān ašān mazgītīhā¹³⁸ frōd hīlēm bē nišānēm āta(x)šān uzdešzārīhā bē kanēm ud pāk kunēm az gēhān tā a-wēn šawēnd druz wišudagān az ēn gēhān,

We shall bring this Sāh Wahrām the worker of mighty deeds, of the Kayānian family, to vengeance on the Arabs (in the same way) as Rōstahm bore the club of vengeance on the world. Their mosques we will cast down, we will set up Fires, their idol-temples we will dig up and purify away from the world so that shall vanish the spawn of the wicked one from this world.

The parallel concluding prayer in Blochet's text reads:

amāh pad ummēd ī madan ī Warhrām ī amāwand pad stahmbagīh ud bēšīh ī awēšān xursandīhā abar barēm kū pad hān zamān pad nērōg ud ayyārīh ī Ohrmazd ud Amahraspandān hamāg dēn dušmenān ī wad.menīšnān ud uzdešn.parastān az bun bē kanēm ud hamāg gēhān az wad.tārīh ud uzdešn.parastīh pāk bawēd ud Dēn ī abēzag ud rāstīh ud frārōnīh wuzurg ēd pad kāmāg.wehdēnān. frajaft,

Under oppression, we are of hope in coming of the mighty Warhrām, and we bear their tyranny joyfully, that at that time, by the might and assistance of Ohrmazd and the Immortal Bountiful Ones, we will eradicate entirely the religion of the enemies, those of bad thought and idol-worshippers, and the whole world will be clean of evil and idolatry, and the Pure Religion and the Truth and great piety [are] desirable [for] Zoroastrians. Finished.

¹³⁷ New Persian *rstm/rwstm*; Draxt ī Asōrīg 41, cf. Unvala 1923, 657, and also von Stackelberg 1901, 380.

¹³⁸ Arabic > New Persian *mazgit*, cf. Weryho 1971.

It is obvious that the structure of both texts is identical, and that they were composed, at least partly, from similar, if not the same, sources, as ZWY with its parallels.

The references to the club, "to vengeance on the Arabs", to the Sīstānīc hero Rōtastahm, compared to "Sāh Wahrām the worker of mighty deeds, of the Kayānīan family", are interesting. Of course, both Vərəθraγna and Rustam carried a club, as many other heroes did, but this interference with the material derived from the post-Sasanian "Book of Kings" is nevertheless surprising, as neither Rustam the Saka, nor the historic Wahrām ī Cōbēn, were of Kayānīan stock, as seen from the point of view of Sasanian loyalists. It was another pattern that worked here¹³⁹, that of the epic of the Eastern Iranian frontier.

If we turn now to the AyJ material as connected to the "Coming of Sāh Wahrām" text, we find there interesting remarks referring to Chinese, Indians and others. As this text (AyJ 15.7-27) contains the Sasanian king-list up to Yazdgird II, the arrangement of the text could be dated.

The reconstructed Pahlavi text of AyJ 8 reads as follows:

1. pursīd Wištāsp šāh kū awēšān mardomān ī pad Hindūgān ud Ctneštān ud Turkeštān ud Tāzīgān ud Barbarestān jud jud dād ud rawišt cē, ūšān zīwandagīh ud nēwagīh ciyōn, ka mīrēnd ō kū abganēnd ūšān ruwān ō kū šawēnd.

2. guftāš Jāmāsp ī bēdaxš kū Hindūgān šahr wuzurg, hast ī sard, hast ī garm, hast ī tarr, hast ī hušk, hast kū dār ud draxt, hast kū dašt ī saxt hast kū wyāb.

3. hast kēšān ziwišnīh az brinj, hast kē az šīr ī gāw, hast kē <az> tohmīhā xʷarēnd.

1. The king Wištāsp asked: "those people who are in India, China, Turkistan, Arabia and Berberia, what are their respective religions and behavior, and their ways of life and goodness? Where are they thrown when they die, and where do their souls go?"

2. Jāmāsp the vice-roy said him: "India is a vast state. In some places it is cold, in some places it is hot, in some places it is wet, in some places it is dry, in some of it there are trees and shrubs, in some of it there are heavy deserts where.

3. There are some whose living is on rice, there are some whose living is on cow-milk, there are some who eat <from> fruits (eggs)".

139 Cf. Davidson 1990.

It is interesting to note (cf. Boyce 1987b, 127) that "there were Zoroastrians among the Hindus, AyJ 8.4-5, and Turks, AyJ 12.9". In AyJ 12.8-9 we indeed have:

Turkeštān wuzurg gyāg ud hamāg sard, wēšag bawēd, ūšān draxt ī barwar ud mēwag ī xʷarišnīg ud *any ciš nihang. Hast az awēšān kē Māh paristēnd ud hast kē jādūg hēnd, ud hast ī Weh.Dēn hēnd.

Turkeštān is a vast place and all of it is cold, it is forests, they have few fruit-trees and eatable fruits and [other eatable] things. There are some among them who worship Moon and there are some who are sorcerers, and there are some who are of the Good Religion.

AyJ 12. 15:

Warz ī ābādānīh kunēnd. ka mīrēnd ō wēšag abganēnd, ud hast ī ō Wahišt ud hast ī ō Dušaxʷ ud Hamēstagān šawēnd.

The cultivate the land. When they die, they throw (their dead) in forests, and there are some who go to Paradise, and there are some who go to Hell and Limbo¹⁴⁰.

¹⁴⁰ This text seems to refer to the Western (or, even to the Khazar) Khaganate rather than to the Eastern Khaganate, as the text mentions forests and the practice of corpse-exposure in forests, similar to that described by Ibn Fadlān with regards to the Volga Bulgars. As to the "Good Religion", there are other Arabo-Persian texts that mention Majūsī among the Western Turks, Khazars, Patzinaks. I will deal with that subject elsewhere. In other Pahlavi texts, Turkeštān means the land of Ugurs, cf. DkM 25.15: ...ciyōn kēš ī YTŠG ī az Hrōm ud hān ī Mōšē azāz Xazarān ud hān ī Mānī azāz Turkeštān tagīgīh ud cērīh Tšān pēš būd be burd ō wadagīh ud dbastagīh andar hamahīān abgand hān ī Mānī az Hrōm fīlso[k]īrāyīhaz anāft, "...like the faith of Jesus from Byzantium, and the faith of Moses from the Khazars, and the faith of Mānī from the Ugurs took away the strength and the vigor they had previously possessed, threw them into vileness and decadence amongst their rivals, and the faith of Mānī even frustrated the Byzantine philosophy", cf. de Menasce 1945, 239-40; Molé 1967, 237. This passage is seen as reflecting Ugur Manichaeism, cf. de Menasce 1945, 240, and as one of the few non-Muslim sources to make note of Khazar Judaism, cf. Golden 1984, 140 n. 38.

Our text speaks, however, of an ambivalent attitude towards the inhabitants of India, whose religious practices were indeed sometimes resembling those of Zoroastrians, due to the common ancestry and the Iranian impact, but sometimes were just the opposite of the Zoroastrian cult. It is not necessary to assume that the *hudēn* in India means specifically "Zoroastrian"; the term may refer to *magēs indianisés*, the Hinduized Magi of Mithra who settled down in India (cf. Humbach 1978¹⁴¹).

The Indians and Chinese were both held in great esteem by the Iranians of the Late Sasanian period. Indian wisdom was transferred into Iran as a part of the project of assembling the dispersed Avesta, and many "secular" works were translated as well¹⁴².

4. ūšān kēš ud dād ud rawišn was, ud hast ī pad nēmag ī Ohrmazd, ud hast ī pad nēmag ī Ahriman ud jādūgīh āškārag kunēnd.

Their faiths and religions and ways of life are multiplied, there are some who are in the (half-) lot of Ohrmazd, there are some who are in the (half-) lot of Ahriman, and they exercise witchcraft publicly.

5. ud ka mīrēnd, hast kē andar zamīg nigān kunēnd, ud hast kē ō āb abganēnd, ud hast kē pad āta(x)š bē sōzēnd, ud harw kē nē hudēn ō dōšax' šawēnd.

And when they die, there are some who bury (their dead) in earth, and there are some who throw (their dead) into water, and there are some who burn (their dead) with fire, and everyone who is not of the Good Religion goes to Hell.

6. ud Cīnestān šahr wuzurg ī was.zarr ud was.mušk ud was.gōhr, mardomān ī.š andar bawēnd kīrrog ud nēzūmān ud bārig wēnišn ēstād bawēnd, But paristēnd, ka mīrēnd, druwand hēnd.

And the state of China is vast, having much gold, much muscus, much jewels, and the people who live in it are artisan and dextrous and of thin complexion, they worship the Buddha, they are unrighteous in their death.

¹⁴¹ Mithra was widely worshipped in Bactria, it is true (but the "reconstruction" of Humbach 1961 caused much harm to exploring genuine Mithraic-non-Zoroastrian elements in Iranian religion). The Median pre-Zoroastrian cult of Mithra xšāērapati was known in Egypt (cf. Boyce 1982, 186 & 265, on a Mythraion used by Persian soldiers at the end of the Achaemenid rule, if not later) and the Near East, including Phoenician cities of the mainland, Cyprus and Carthage, and it is quite possible that Alexander used this cult in his propaganda against the Achaemenids, the stubborn Mazdēans (cf. Bivar 1975; Bivar 1994, 69); in this context the burning of Avesta might make a better sense.

¹⁴² So, Kalilah wa Dimnah, Tūṭī Nāmāh, Sindbād Nāmāh were translated about 550. On Indian motifs via Sasanian Iran in Greece and Syria, cf. Shaked 1984a, 49-50.

This is a rather vivid description of the pre-T'ang China¹⁴³. When Zoroastrianism first appeared in China in the early 6th century, it was spared of the general persecutions of foreign religions¹⁴⁴. Buddhism became popular in China only after the fall of the Han Dynasty in the 3rd century CE, although the penetration of this religion began as early as the 1st century from Tibet. Later on, Parthian and Kushan Iranians played an important rôle in bringing the Buddhist gospel to China, a Parthian prince *Arshak (An Shih-kao, An Shi-gao), a Sogdian K'ang Seng-hui and a Parthian merchant An¹⁴⁵ Hsüan (Xuan) being instrumental among them in this process. In the 4th century Buddhism became the state religion of China. At the end of the same century, Chinese Buddhism penetrated Korea, and about 552 this religion appears in Japan, via Korea. Li Shi-min, or the Emperor Tai Tsung, the founder of the T'ang (618-907) Dynasty, opposed Buddhism and promoted the teachings of Confucius, and during the Huichang (841-6) Period, many sects were suppressed in China. All this perhaps indicates a pre-T'ang date of our passage, namely, the epoch of the Warring States and the Sui Period (589-618) that followed it.

7. Tāzīgān ud Barbarestān šahr garm ud hušk wyābān, nēst bar ud āb tang ūšān x'varīšn šir ud xrafstarān ud mūs ud mār ud gurbag, rōbāh ud kaftār ud abārig az ēn ēwēn, uzdeš paristēnd ūšān zīwišn az uštr ud cahār.pād, any ciš nēst.

The land[s] of Arabs and Berbers is a hot and dry desert, it has no fruit and water is scarce, and their food is milk and *xrafstras* and mice and snakes and cats, foxes and hyenas and others of that kind, they worship images/statues and their living is on but camels and quadrupeds, having nothing else.

It is fairly clear that this description of Arabia is of pre-Islamic origin; though the importance of *uzdeš* (Arab stone-worship? Christianity?) for this dating is uncertain, but the tone is not hostile (as in the Zoroastrian texts from the Islamic period), and we are told nothing about *dād ī wad ī Tāzīgān, "the wicked law of the Arabs" (=Islam); Berberia could have been mentioned only during the short period of the Sasanian occupation of the Western outskirts of Siwah and Fayoum¹⁴⁶. As it was in 618 that the T'ang dynasty, with its initial anti-Buddhist politics,

¹⁴³ Except, of course, the idea that the Chinese go to Hell, thus having no chance of salvation.

¹⁴⁴ Watson 1983, 554.

¹⁴⁵ "An" means "Parthian".

¹⁴⁶ For Barbaristan in the East of Iran, cf. Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 88-91.

climbed to power in China, it is hardly possible that the Persians learned about this anti-Buddhist bias of the newly-established dynasty immediately, while, at almost the same time, in the spring of 619, Persian armies entered Egypt - and "Berberia". The conclusion should be that these two passages describing China, Arabs and Berbers are to be dated about 619-625, as in 625 Heracleus and his "Türkoto-Khazar" ally YabryuQayan attacked the Sasanian Transcaucasia, sacking Tbilisi with its garrison of Persians and their Christian Georgian allies¹⁴⁷.

At least from the times of Kawšō I [Chinese *kia-ywa-ta] (488-96, 498-531), there were diplomatic contacts between Persia and China. The peak of Sasanian-Chinese relations was reached in the early years of the T'ang dynasty (beginning in 618 CE), the very last period of Sasanian Iran. Zoroastrianism (Chinese: Xian, Hsien, *xen, *t'ien, tian, "heaven") had existed in China, in some form, as early as the 6th century (prior to the arrival of the Sasanian refugees who fled the Arabs¹⁴⁸), having later attained, still in the Sasanian period, a degree of official recognition.

There were four fire-temples in the Chinese T'ang capital, and others in different parts of China, including the city of K'ang-feng¹⁴⁹. Some of these temple were still referred to as late as the 12th century. In 638 CE, the last Sasanian king of kings, Yazdgird III (632-651), Chinese Yi-si-si, squeezed by the Arabs and the Turks, sent an embassy to the Bayfūr, "the son of Heaven", as the Persian called the Chinese emperor¹⁵⁰.

Yazdgird's son Pērōz, Chinese Bi-lu-si (unnamed in Bd 33.21), continued his father's resistance to the Arabs, seeking Chinese support. Compare two passages, the first taken from a post-Sasanian version of X'adāy Nāmag and preserved in Bd 33, the second being a piece of Pērōz's propaganda preserved in ZWY 7.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Dan Shapira, "Armenian and Georgian accounts on the Capture of Tbilisi by the Byzantines and Khazars" (forthcoming).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Pulleybank 1992, 429a.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 429b.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Bd 33.20: ud ka x'adāyih ē Yazdgird mad wēst sai x'adāyih kard ēg Tāzīgān pad was maragih ē ērān dwārist hēnd Yazdgird pad kārizar abāg awēšān nē škōfēd ud ē X'arāsān ud Turkestān šūd ud asp ud mard ē ayārīh x'āst ūšān ānōh šzad, "and when the reign came to Yazdgird, he ruled for twenty years, then the Arabs rushed into Iran in large numbers: Yazdgird is not triumphant in the battle against them; he went to X'arāsān and Turkestān to ask there for support in horses and men, and they killed him there". Note that here Turkestān is used in the sense of the Chinese outer possessions in Central Asia; note also the matter-of-fact statement about Yazdgird's death and compare it to the versions of the Sāh Wahrām text: "the King of Kings was slain like a dog".

Bd 33.21: pus ī Yazdgird ē Hindūgān šūd ud spāh ī gund āwurd pēš az madan ī *ō X'arāsān uzīd ud hān spāh gund wišuft ud ērān šahr pad Tāzīgān mānd..., "the son of Yazdgird went to India and brought a large army; before its (the army's) arrival in X'arāsān, he went into exile and this large army was disturbed and the Iranian Realm remained in the hands of the Arabs...";

ZWY 7.7: awē Kay ka sīh sālāg bawēd ... pad amar drafš spāh, spāh ī Hindūg ud Cēnīg ul grift drafš hend [cē drafš ul gīrēnd], abrāstag drafš hēnd, abrāstag zēn hēnd, pad tāziēn ul tāzēnd tā Wehrōd..., "when the Kay will be thirty years of age ..., the armies with innumerable banners, the Indian¹⁵¹ and the Chinese armies having up-raised banners [for they will raise the banners aloft], having erect banners, having erect weapons, they will make razziahs upto Wehrōd...".

After 659, Pērōz was recognized by the Chinese as ruler of Po-ssu, which is Chinese for Persia¹⁵², with his capital at Zarang (Ji-ling), Sīstān. Pērōz's own son, Ni-nie-shih¹⁵³, was supported by the Chinese and the Turk rulers for about 20 years in Tōxarēstān, until he returned to the Chinese capital between 707-9.

However, the Po-ssu - T'ang contacts remained stable until the Talas battle in 751¹⁵⁴, as the Sasanian princes residing in Ch'ang-an kept up a pretence of royal diplomacy with the Chinese imperial court¹⁵⁵.

The puppet kingdom of Po-ssu maintained by the Chinese in the area of Kābulēstān and known to Iranians as Hindūgān ("India"¹⁵⁶), seems to have disappeared only after the battle of Talas, a century after most of Iran was seized by the Arabs. Nevertheless, the existence of a semi-independent Sasanian state in Eastern Iran under Chinese aegis for such a long period of

¹⁵¹ A much later tradition is recorded in Māh ī Frawardīn rōz ī Xurdād 28: Māh ī Frawardīn rōz ī Xurdād Wahrām ī Warzāwand az Hindūgān ē paydāgīh āyēd, "Wahrām ī Warzāwand will appear from India in the month of Frawardīn on the day of Xurdād". Cf. also below.

¹⁵² Historically, for Parthia, cf. Watson 1983, 542.

¹⁵³ The Chinese spelling suggests the pseudo-archaic *Nērosang for the name of the prince otherwise known as Narsēh.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Pulleybank 1992, 425-6.

¹⁵⁵ Watson 1983, 547.

¹⁵⁶ For Persian (Sasanian and post-Sasanian) and Arab authors, "India" comprised the territories now occupied by Pakistan and Afghanistan, rather than those of the Republic of India.

time must have made some impact on the loyal Zoroastrians of Western Iran; the notion of Kābulēstān / "India" as the place wherefrom the Victorious King shall come can be dated to this Po-ssu period. Later on, as late as in the 9th century¹⁵⁷, after the kingdom of Po-ssu was liquidated, descendants of the refugees from the Sasanian Empire were still serving as Chinese soldiers at the Chinese capital of Ch'ang-an. Sasanian military commanders held high position in the Chinese army, as we know from the bilingual tomb-inscription of Ma (*Māhnuš), wife of Su-liang (*Farroxzād) from Xi-an (Hsian, Xi'an), Shan-xi province (874 CE); they retained their Pahlavi language, at least as a written one, for generations after the Islamic devastation of their lost homeland¹⁵⁸.

The existence of such "post-Sasanian" military troops in the service of the Chinese must have been well known in the Zoroastrian circles of Iran which became already heavily Islamized at that time. In the 8th century, the T'ang Chinese still held things Iranian in high esteem, though Iran itself had been taken over by the Arabs.

Destree 1971 singled out in the Late Sasanian apocalyptic imagery the topos of a royal hero fleeing eastwards. However, even prior to Yazdgird III, this topos had a very real historical background: Kawād I found refuge with the Hephthalites in 496-8, then returned to power, Wahrām ī Cōbēn had to flee to Balkh, to the Turks, his earlier defeated enemies. Many Wahrāmic traditions are found - and are to be found - in the Middle Persian apocalyptic texts, first of all, in ZWY and JN¹⁵⁹. Some pieces of Wahrām's propaganda survived in writings of Mobads, and some measure of censorship was required to keep such texts concealed (ZWY 1. 7-8). The Mobads, at first, supported Wahrām having been outraged by Hormizd, but later Wahrām "got angry with the clergy who taught differently"¹⁶⁰. The reason was, it seems, Wahrām's claim to be of Kayānian origin, a tradition preserved by Muslim authors.

In the consequence, Wahrām was defeated in Aḏarbayjān by united forces of the Byzantines, Armenians (organized by Bistām, the uncle of Xusraw II, and by Smbat Bagratuni), Persian prisoners of war (released by the Byzantines), under command of Xusraw II. According to some

reports, Wahrām married the Xaqan's daughter¹⁶¹; he tried to maintain a sort of continuous guerilla against the Sasanians, and was presumably murdered by Sasanian agents. Bistām, threatened by Xusraw's drowning of Bindoe, his brother, fled to Alburz and succeeded to maintain for a decade a small realm at Rayy, supported by Wahrām ī Cōbēn's partisans. And some decades later, the last Sasanian King of Kings made the same trek to the Turks.

In this context, combined with the evidence of a semi-independent Sasanian state in Kābulēstān / Toxārestān / "India", we can state that the expectation for Wahrām ī Warzāwand is actually a piece of Wahrām ī Cōbēn's propaganda adopted for the needs of Pērōz the son of Yazdgird III. The poor state of redaction of the Early New Persian in Pahlavi of the genuine *Zand* of Wahman Yašt (the second part of the *Šhrmazd* Yašt, not to be confused with ZWY, cf. above) reveals that this text was repeatedly re-worked, and it is not without interest that the name *Vərəθrəyana-* (Wahrān / Wahrām) is glossed by Pērōz, referring thus, to my opinion, to Pērōz the son of Yazdgird III. The two events, Wahrām's flight to Balkh after his defeat by the "Romans", and the flight of Pērōz, the son of the last Sasanian King of Kings Yazdgird III, in the same direction, were merged in later Zoroastrian epic and apocalyptic texts, and gave birth to Messianic expectations of Redemption from the East¹⁶².

The practical irrelevance of Wahrām's claims to be a Kayānian in the Muslim epoch helped to assimilate the pieces of his propaganda into orthodox Zoroastrian texts after the collapse of the Empire, while they were re-used for the propaganda needs by members of the Sasanian House. After all, Kay Wahrām of the propaganda pieces was the name of Vərəθrəyana, the Dragon-Killer, and until this day, the Parsees expect the Return of the Messiah, Wahrām.

This Redeemer Wahrām must accomplish exploits generally ascribed to Frēdōn, such as triumph over Aži Dahāg, and indeed, the two figures merged very early. One may suggest that the composition of KNP with its strongly anti-Arsacid overtones was made under the impression of Kayānian claims of Wahrām, an Arsacid; moreover, the link between the figures of Vərəθrəyana and Frēdōn was, at least partly, responsible for the hinted description of the Arsacids as connected with Aži Dahāg, in the disguise of Kirm in KNP.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Hamatta 1971a & 1971b; Pulleyblank 1992, 426b.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Sundermann & Thilo 1966; Hamatta 1971a & 1971b; Ecsedy 1971; Humbach & Wang Shihing 1988. The exodus of Iranians to China was doubtless more massive than that to India proper. However, there were the unique conditions of India that made the Parsee survival possible.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Czeplédy 1958, 32-39.

¹⁶⁰ Simokattes iv 12, quoted in Czeplédy 1958, 39.

¹⁶¹ Later, according to some other sources, these were the descendants of Wahrām ī Cōbēn and his Turkic wife that became the Khazar rulers. Another tradition connected the ruling house of Sarr with Wahrām ī Cōbēn. Both traditions seem to be purely legendary.

¹⁶² Cf. Destree 1971, 641-4; cf. also Bailey 1943, 196.

All those hopes and expectations made a considerable impact on the arising *Sīrāh*. As late as 750, a "Mazdakite" *Sindbad*, deriving his teachings *az kutub i Banī Sāsān* expected a *raja'ah* of his *Mahdī*, *Abū Muslim*, from the latter's *jalbah* in *biṣār* *ī az mis kardah*¹⁶³ (*Siyāsat Nāmah*, quoted from Czeglédy 1958, 40-41).

The *Jāmāsp Nāmag* (JN) 2ff. (especially 19-30, 33-37, 40-41, 46-50, 71-72, 74-82, 97-106) presents a sample of a version similar to both the account of GrBd 33 (though having been interwoven with pseudo-historical prophecies *ex eventu* and political propaganda), and to ZWY 7 & 9. Both Bd and ZWY have a similar character of recent compositions based on extensive quoting of *Zand* material, at odds with, say, *Wizdīgāh* *ī Zadsprahm* (WZs), based on "second-hand" *Zandic* material¹⁶⁴.

An independent tradition of elaborating both *Zands* and political pamphlets could be easily traced in JN; this tradition is similar to that of ZWY. The text of *Jāmāsp Nāmag* exists in two recensions: 1) as Chapter 16 of *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg*¹⁶⁵ (AyJ) and 2) as an independent composition¹⁶⁶ under the name *Jāmāsp Nāmag*, which was extremely popular among the *Parsees*. This composition consists of a prophecy about the end of the Zoroaster's millennium, accompanied by the coming of *Pēšōtan* and *Hōšēdar*; parallels with numerous passages preserved in ZWY are so impressive that there can be hardly any doubt about the common written *Zand* sources of both AyJ 16 = JN and ZWY; however, in JN there are some peculiar details.

Benveniste 1932 established the poetic¹⁶⁷ character of JN and linked it to other Iranian and non-Iranian apocalyptic texts. As to AyJ 17, it exists only in Pāzand, and is of similar character.

¹⁶³ Also called, after the place where *Wahrām ī Cōbēn* fled to the *Khaḡan, Rōyēn* Diz, Diž-i Rōyīn, Turkish Bakır Balıy.

¹⁶⁴ In this respect, it is worth notice that the name of *Bundahīšn* / *Zand ī Agāhīh* (and, perhaps, of *Zand ī Wahman Yasn*) contain elements easily identifying them as *Zands*: *Bun*, *Zand*, *Yasn*. Even if the names are new inventions, it is remarkable that the Tradition has seen here *Zands*.

¹⁶⁵ *Ayādgār ī Jāmāspīg* exists in Pahlavi, Pārsī, translated also into Persian and Gujarati, but the complete text is in Pāzand; Pahlavi edited in West 1904, 97-116; various versions by Modi 1903; Messina 1939; reviewed by Pagliaro 1922, *RSO*, 147-54 (*non vid.*).

¹⁶⁶ This chapter was edited and translated by Bailey 1930-32, 55-85 & 581-600, with addenda, *ib.*, 822-4 & 948, reprinted, without the Addenda, in Bailey 1981, *Opera Minora* I, ed. M. Nawabi, Shiraz, 22-55, 57-76, and by Benveniste 1932, 337-80. Cf. also Tavadiā 1956, 124-6; Utas 1975, 409-11; *de Menasce* 1983, 1194-5.

¹⁶⁷ There are still problems involving Pahlavi poetic traditions which cannot be treated here. The relationship of Middle Persian epic poetry to *Zands* and vice versa deserves a special study.

AyJ as a whole has various sources: chapters 2-3, e.g., derives ultimately from lost Avestan texts, similar to those that were among sources of Bd¹⁶⁸. In 3.6-7 it is stated that *Ōhrmazd's* creation of the six *Amāša Spēntas* was like lamps being lit one from another, being an interesting tradition unattested otherwise.

In AyJ 15.5-6 (cf. above) it is said that after Alexander the rule will pass to *husrāw Partawān*, "the renowned Parthians", then Iran will prosper. As it is at odds with the standard Sasanian slander¹⁶⁹ of the Arsacid rule, a Parthian transmission of some of the material was suggested¹⁷⁰. Other material is of Persian origin, notably the Sasanian king-list up to Yazdgird III in AyJ 15.7-27.

Here the text will be given only in English, as the transcribed Pahlavi is easily available in the Bailey's and Messina's editions. The synthetic text presented here is not, of course, an attempt to reconstruct the "real *Urtext*", but merely an attempt to demonstrate the different components of this composition. The borders between fragments are sometimes difficult to be established, thus there is some degree of overlapping in treating the different strata of the composition.

*Jāmāsp Nāmag*¹⁷¹

1. *Wištāsp* asked, saying: "How many years will this Pure Religion endure, and afterwards what times and seasons will come?"
2. *Jāmāsp*, the viceroy¹⁷², said: "It will endure a thousand years¹⁷³."
3. Then those men who are at that time will all become covenant-breakers¹⁷⁴.

This introduction is, of course, parallel to both introductions to ZWY, but the *dramatis personae* are *Jāmāsp* and *Wištāsp*, as in AyJ¹⁷⁵, not *Ōhrmazd* and Zoroaster as in ZWY [cf. APPENDIX II *Saxaiša*].

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Boyce 1987b, 127a.

¹⁶⁹ There are some remnants of Parthian traditions in Sasanian texts; thus, *Sahrstān* *ī Erān* §41 has: *šahrstān ī Staxr Ardawān ī Pahlāvīgān šāh kard*, "the city of Staxr (or, rather, Persepolis?) built Ardawān the Parthian king". It is impossible that this passage was taken from KNP 1.2-4 (cf. Markwart & Messina 1931, 91).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Boyce, *ibid.*

¹⁷¹ The translation adopted is that given in Bailey 1930-32, with slight alterations.

¹⁷² *Jāmāsp* is given here the Parthian title of *bidaxš*. This fact can bear some importance for dating the text, adding some new evidence to the Parthian features noted by Boyce. It should be added that in the 6th century CE the title was applied to Sasanian commissioners in Georgia.

¹⁷³ Compare ZWY 1.6-4.2

¹⁷⁴ Compare ZWY 4.11: "They have no contracts, faith, truth and ordinance..."

¹⁷⁵ AyJ 1.10-13 has a parallel in AyZ 35-8, Boyce *ibid.*

19. And the younger brother will strike the elder brother¹⁷⁶, and will take his wealth¹⁷⁷, and for his wealth will make false statement¹⁷⁸.

20. And a woman will commit mortal sin against her own life¹⁷⁹.

21. And the inferior and obscure man will come into notice¹⁸⁰.

22. And wrong and false witness and lies will abound.

23. By night one with another they will eat bread and drink wine, and walk in friendship, and next day they will plot one against the life of the other and plan evil.

24. And in that evil time him who has no children they deem fortunate, but him who has children they hold cheap in their eyes.

25. And many men will go into exile and foreign lands and fall into distress.¹⁸¹

26. And the atmosphere will be confounded, and cold wind and hot wind will blow.

27. And the fruit of the plants will become less, and earth will be without fruit.

28. And the earth will be corrupt and injurious and will cause much desolation.

29. And unseasonable rain will fall, and that which falls will be unprofitable and bad.

30. Clouds will gather over the sky.

33. And every man who has little good, for him life becomes more savorless and more evil.

For this section, compare ZWY 4.16:

ZWY 4.16. ...the Sun's rays will be very level and much concealed, and the year, month and day will be shorter.

ZWY 4.17. And Spendarmat the Earth will be very narrow, and the roads will be very intricate¹⁸².

ZWY 4.19. And the plants, trees and shrubs will diminish...

ZWY 4.42. And it will not be possible for a fortunate cloud and the holy wind to produce rain at the proper time and season.

ZWY 4.43. A gloomy cloud shall benight the whole sky.

¹⁷⁶ Compare ZWY 4.15: "The affection of the father will depart from the son, and that of the brother from his brother..."

¹⁷⁷ Perhaps, a reference to Mazdak; on Mazdak, cf. ZWY 4.21 and perhaps ZWY 4.35 (if not the Arabs are those who meant). JN 20 refers almost evidently to the Mazdakite excesses, and JN 21 refers, in all probability to Wahrām ī Cōbēn.

¹⁷⁸ Compare the gloss to ZWY 4.9: "that is, they will not do what they say".

¹⁷⁹ A fairly clear reference to Mazdakite excesses.

¹⁸⁰ Compare ZWY 4.5: "...their lineage will be not manifest". Cf. n.10.

¹⁸¹ It is possible this paragraph refers to the post-Sasanian period. Compare ZWY 4.54; for contrast, cf. DkM 748.13-15, Shaki 1974, 334; abar mādan ī zamīg, xvāstag ud tīs ī anērān dāšt ō < w>āspuhragān xvēšth ī yak az Erān, on the coming of land, property or anything, held by foreigners, into the private (absolute) ownership of one of Iran.

¹⁸² Compare JN 28.

ZWY 4.44. The hot wind and the cold wind will arrive and carry away the crops and the seeds of crops.

ZWY 4.45. The rain, too, will not rain at the proper season; it will rain the noxious creatures more than water.

ZWY 4.46. And the water of rivers and springs will diminish and it will have no increase.

To JN again:

34. A small house, being built, will pass for a mansion.

35. A horseman will become a man on foot, and the man on foot a horseman.

36. Slaves will walk in the path of nobles.

37. Save through Yazdān, nobility is not a guest in any body.

40. The youth swiftly will become an old man.

41. And everyone who rejoice in his own bad deeds, they will hold in his privilege.

46. And the men who are born in that evil time will be harder than hard iron and brass, save that they are likewise blood and flesh they will be harder than stone.

47. And mockery and defilement will be an ornament.

48. And everyone will turn to strange ways and kinship with Ahriman the evil.

49. And the covenant-breakers will work injury at that time.

50. Swiftly and speedily their hands will be given to sureties, as the streams of a river flow to the sea.

70. This too I will tell you that it is better for him who is not born from his mother, or if he is born, dies and does not see so much evil and oppression.

71. At the end of the millennium of Zoroaster they will not see the great conflict which must take place.

72. So much bloodshed must occur at that time, of mankind one part in three parts¹⁸³ will not survive.

74. Then Spendarmat will cry aloud to Ōhrmad saying: "I cannot melt away this evil and badness.

75. I am turned upside down and I turn mankind here upside down"¹⁸⁴.

76. Wind and fire injure men, by reason of the great grief and wrong they do to them.

¹⁸³ Bailey 1933-35, 582: §72, p. 582 and p. 588 to be corrected: pad 10 bahr ē bahr, as in Persian Jāmdasp-Nāmag, Mod 85.18 (mardom andar Erānšahr az dāh bahra bahrī namānand). However, cf. ZWY 9.15: "one-third".

¹⁸⁴ These two paragraphs seem to be connected to ZWY 9.17-19; it is strange, nevertheless, that the mention of Spendarmat is absent from the parallel place in ZWY, while Waters and Fire are not mentioned here. Compare also the displaced JN § 83. I will deal with this subject at length elsewhere.

77. Then Mithra and Xēšm will fight together in that conflict.
78. An evil spirit who is called Wad-Yawagān (causer of bad crops) was bound during the reign of Yima, but escaped from his bonds in the reign of Bēwarasp.
79. Bēwarasp had conference with that evil spirit.
80. Now the work of that evil spirit is this: he diminishes the crop of corn.
81. Had it not been for that evil spirit, whosoever had sown one bushel would have received 4000 bushels of corn.
82. 496 years Mithra attacks that evil spirit, and thereafter whosoever sows one bushel, puts 400 bushels in his granary¹⁸⁵.
97. By the might of the gods and the Iranian Splendor of the Kavis and the Mazda-worshipping Religion and the Splendor of Pādaśxvārgar, and Mithra and Sroš and Rašn and the waters and the sacred and domestic Fires they will wage furious battle.
98. And he will prove better than them; he will slay so many of the enemies, that their number cannot be counted.
99. Then Sroš and Nēryōsang will stir up your son Pēšōtan by command of Ohrmazd the Creator from the Kavian Kang fortress.
100. Your son Pēšōtan will come with 150 disciples, whose raiment is white and black.
101. And my hand will hold the banner as far as Pārs to the place where the fires and waters are established¹⁸⁶.
102. There he will perform the Yašt.
103. When the Yašt is finished, they will pour the libation into the water and will give the libation to the fire.
104. The wicked and the demons and the Xyōns will perish as in a cold winter the leaves of trees of wither¹⁸⁷.
105. The time of the wolves will pass away, and the time of the sheep will enter in.
106. Hōšēdar son of Zoroaster will appear to reveal the Religion, and evil will be at an end, joy and gladness and happiness will have come.

Another layer in this composition contains later additions; it seems there were several stages of glossing the old Zand, thus some pieces were deeply assimilated into the new framework:

¹⁸⁵ Compare ZWY 4.18.

¹⁸⁶ Though this paragraph does not, actually, belong to the original apocalyptic composition, but it is impossible to put it in any other place.

¹⁸⁷ An old Yašt fragment. The text of ZWY 7.16 is, actually, identical.

2. Jāmāsp, the viceroy, said: "It (the millennium of Zoroaster) will endure a thousand years¹⁸⁸.
3. Then those men who are at that time will all become covenant-breakers.
4. One with another they will be revengeful and envious and false.
5. And for that reason the Iranian countries will be delivered up to the Arabs and the Arabs will daily grow stronger and stronger and will seize district after district".

The reason for the fall of the Sasanian Empire given here is astonishingly not Zoroastrian, but rather a "Jewish" one (or channelled through Christian intermediary): there a linkage is made between the behavior of the Iranians and the transfer of their country to the Arabs, seen as a divine punishment. It is obvious that this particular passage was composed after the Arab onslaught, and what we have in these three small paragraphs is a rare opportunity to peep into the changing mood of the post-Sasanian Zoroastrianism.

It is, however, not necessarily a borrowing from the Biblical tradition, but simply a plain parallel development, demonstrating, one more time, the structural similarities between Judaism and Zoroastrianism, two religions of a similar historical fate.

6. Men will turn to unrighteousness and falsehood, and all that they say or do will be the more profitable for themselves.
7. And from them righteous conduct will be distant.
8. For their lawlessness, these Iranian countries will come as a heavy burden to the governors of the provinces¹⁸⁹.
9. And they will store up the tale of gold and silver, and much treasure and wealth also, and all will disappear and pass out of sight.
10. And much royal treasure and wealth also will pass into the hands and possession of enemies.
11. And untimely deaths will abound.
12. And all the Iranian countries will fall into the hands of those enemies.
13. And Anērān and Erān will be confounded, so that the Iranian will not be distinguished from the foreigner; those who are Iranians will turn back to foreign ways.

¹⁸⁸ Note that, unlike ZWY 1 & 3, here the idea of world-ages is not presented. As was mentioned above, here the conference is between the first Zoroastrian king and his vice minister (called here "viceroy"), not between Zoroaster and the Lord Wisdom. Another important difference is that JN knows only one Savior.

¹⁸⁹ It is difficult to interpret this passage in historical terms.

§§ 7-14 refer to the last years of the Sasanian Empire: Turkic invasions, Byzantines plunder the capital and the Royal treasure and the most sacred shrines, etc. It is the second part of the passage that refers to the Arab invasion, cf. § 52.

14. And in that evil time rich men will deem the poor fortunate, but the poor man will not himself be fortunate¹⁹⁰.

15. And the nobles and the great will come to a savorless life¹⁹¹.

16. And to them death will seem as sweet as to father and mother the sight of children and to a mother a dowered daughter.

17. The daughter who is born of her she will sell for a price¹⁹².

18. And the son will strike father and mother and during his life-time will deprive him of authority in the family¹⁹³.

19. And the younger brother will strike the elder brother, and will take his wealth, and for his wealth will make false statement¹⁹⁴.

§§ 7-19 refer to events after *Andšurwān*, interspersed with some additions of older and younger character. §§ 31-45 refer to the earlier events:

31. And the scribe will come with bad writing¹⁹⁵.

32. And everyone will repudiate word and statement, covenant and agreement.

38. And the men of that Great House¹⁹⁶ will turn to mockery and iniquity and know not the flavor of wealth.

39. And for them affection and love will be towards the despised man¹⁹⁷.

42. And the several districts and provinces and cultivated tracts one with another will struggle in conflict.

190 A topos going back to texts about the fate of the soul in afterlife, like AWN. Cf. also ZWY 3.15-18.

191 This particular passage refers rather to the Mazdak's extremism than to the Arab invasion.

192 Compare ZWY 4.15: "and the mother will be separated from the daughter and will be of a different will".

193 Perhaps the excesses of forced Islamization are meant.

194 Cf. note 13.

195 §§ 31-32 are undoubtedly criticism on written texts seen as unorthodox. Mazdakite literature, or the propaganda pieces by Wahrām ī Cōbēn or eschatological writings are meant. It seems to be no coincidence that it is the same text that accused scribes of composing wrong texts that states also that the *real* secrets as regards the eschaton shall be revealed by Mithra, cf. JN 88-89.

196 The term used is *wis*; it refers perhaps to the Parthian royal family.

197 If the view expressed with hesitation in the previous note is true, then Ardašīr is meant. However, Wahrām ī Cōbēn is a candidate as well.

43. And from another he will take a thing as plunder¹⁹⁸.

44. And the contentious and greedy and violent man they will deem good, but wise man of good faith they will hold as demoniac¹⁹⁹.

45. And the several persons will not attain their desires according to their needs²⁰⁰.

§§ 51-57 refer to the events of the post-Sasanian period:

51. And the fires of the Iranian countries will come to an end and be extinguished.

52. And treasure and wealth will come into the hands of foreigners, and all will become men of evil faith²⁰¹.

53. And they will amass much wealth, but they will not enjoy the fruit of it.

54. And it will all pass into the hands of unprofitable governors.

55. And everyone will disapprove the work done by the other.

56. And the harshness and evil of those men will come upon these.

57. They will hold life savorless and death of refuge.

§§ 58-62 are a clear-cut piece of the *anti-Wahrāmian* propaganda:

58. Then there will arise in the land of x^y arāšān an insignificant and obscure man who will go forth in great power, and with him many men and horses, and sharp lances, and the land will be made his own by violence and dominion.

59. He himself in the midst of his dominion will fail and pass out of sight.

60. The whole sovereignty will pass from men of the Iranian countries and will go to foreigners²⁰².

61. And doctrines and laws and ways of life will abound.

62. The slaying of one by the other they will consider a merit and the slaying of men will be a slight thing.

198 In §§ 42-43, civil wars in the last decades of the Sasanian Empire are referred to.

199 The Mazdakite movement is described here.

200 This is a criticism against the Mazdakite interpretation of *paymān*.

201 Obviously, in §§ 51-52, the Arab onslaught is meant. Compare §§ 9-10 and 13.

202 The text of §§ 59-60 perhaps is to be emended: "He himself in the midst of his dominion will pass from men of the Iranian countries and will go to the foreigners", applying to Wahrām ī Cōbēn and making better sense.

§§ 63-6 tell us that a victorious king (*Abarwēz Xwādāy*), obviously *Pērōz II*, will vanquish the Byzantium:

63. And this too I will tell you that it will be at that time: that victorious²⁰³ king will seize in the land of Byzantium²⁰⁴ much territory and many cities and will carry off much treasure at one time from the land of Byzantium.

64. Then that victorious king will die, and thenceforth his sons will sit in sovereignty and will guard the land with bravery²⁰⁵.

§§ 65-69 confused the sons of *Pērōz I* with the sons of *Pērōz II*.

65. And they will deal very fiercely and lawlessly with the men of the Iranian countries.

66. And much wealth of all kinds will pass into their hands.

67. Afterwards they too will perish and have no success.

68. In that evil time affection and reverence will not exist.

69. Among them the great will not be distinct from the small nor the small from the great, and they will not assist one another.

A post-Sasanian passage again:

70. This too I will tell you that it is better for him who is not born from his mother, or if he is born, dies and does not see so much evil and oppression.

73. Those Arabs will be confounded with Byzantines and Turks and they will desolate the world.

Here follows a dislocated paragraph taken from a broader description of the *Frašgird*. The parallel version, PRDD 48.70 & 86, speaks, however, of *Sahrēwar*, the deity of metals, but it acts there in close association with *Spandarmat*:

²⁰³ We have in this passage a piece of evidence for some eschatological expectations connected with *Pērōz II*. *Sūdōmand Pērōzgār*, "Profitable Victor", is one of the renderings of the Avestan name of the Coming Savior. The usual generalized name of *Sōšyans*, Avestan *Astvaī.aratā*, is rendered in Dk 7.10.15-17 (Molé 1967, 100-1; cf. also Colpe 1981, 548) as *Sūdōmand Pērōzgār*, thus being a translation of *Saošyān*:-

²⁰⁴ Cf. DkM 749.13-15, Shaki 1974, 334; *abar mādan ī zamīg, xwāstag ud tis ī anērān dāšt ō <w>aspuhragān xwēšth ī ēwag az Erān*, "on the coming of land, property or anything, held by foreigners, into the private (absolute) ownership of one of Iran".

²⁰⁵ *cērīh*. Bailey has here "violence", having been influenced by § 65.

83. At that time *Spandarmat* will open her mouth, and will bring abundant jewels and metals to the light.

Again an apocalyptic piece of anti-Wahrāmian hue:

84. Afterwards a man will arise from the southern²⁰⁶ quarter who will seek dominion and will have an army and troops equipped and will seize lands by violence and cause much bloodshed until his affairs satisfy his desires.

85. Then at last he will flee from the land of his enemies to *Zābul* and go to that district.

86. Thence, an army being equipped, he will return and thenceforward the men of the Iranian countries will fall into grievous despair.

87. Great and small will fall to seeking remedies and will look to a refuge for their own soul.

The next two paragraphs were dealt with differently ²⁰⁷. To my opinion, the *Last Things to be revealed is a military strategem for an eschatological battle. The setting of that passage (which I see as a kind of a Zand to Y 48.3* ²⁰⁸) in a context of war preparations, confirms this view:

88. Afterwards in *Pādašxvārgar*, near the sea-shore, a man will see the god *Mithra*²⁰⁹ and the god *Mithra* will tell many hidden secrets to that man

89. And *Mīhr Yazad* will tell many hidden secrets to that man.

The last portion is a part of a late Sasanian apocalypse arranged from different strata. It is almost impossible to single out different sources, as they became interwoven.

90. He will send him with a message to the King of *Padišxvārgar*, saying: "Why do you support that king, deaf and blind? Now do you too act as king even as the fathers and forefathers of you and yours have done".

91. That man will say: "How should I be able to exercise dominion, since I have not the troops and army and treasure and generals such as my father and forefathers had?".

²⁰⁶ According to several traditions survived in Arabic, *Wahrām I Cōbēn* came from *Nēmōz*, South, *Pārs*, cf. Czeglédy 1958, 34 n. 68.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Messina 1939, 73; Bailey 1930-32, 584; Shaked 1969, 207; Russell 1988/89, 166 n. 19, took it as an eschatological passage; cf. Shaked 1994, 74 n.5.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Y 48.3: *spantō vīduuā yācīti gūzrā sēnghāghō*, "[the munificent holy Ahura], who knows even the secret proclamations", where the Pahlavi has *abzōnīg āgāh [hān hērbēd] kē hānaz nihānīhā saxwan [ī ahlamōgīhā ūš cārag bē gowēd]*, "He will tell secret things concerning heresy and its remedy" (cf. Messina 1930, 80f.). In the *Yasna*, it is *Ohrmazd* who reveals the secrets; however, in our passage, as in all the parallel loci dealing with the final smiting *Aži.Dahāk*:- it is *Mithra*, an old military deity, who plays a prominent rôle.

²⁰⁹ As to the notion of seeing *Mithra* on a sea-shore, though differently explained, compare Arabic *muhurqān*, "sea-shore", not yet attested, to my knowledge, as an Iranian loan in Arabic.

92. The messenger will say: "Come, that I may deliver up to you the treasure and wealth of your fathers and forefathers".

93. And he will show him the vast treasure of Frāsyāb.

The treasures of Frāsyāb may refer here to the loot assembled by Wahrām ī Cōbēn from the Turks, but also to the eschatological idea expressed in other sources²¹⁰ as "exposing the precious metals by Spendarmat". It seems that the last paragraphs refer to the existence of a small Sasanian kingdom of Pu-ssu, under the Chinese aegys, some decades after 651 CE. The Sasanian king ruling there is referred to as Pēšōtan, the descendant of Wištāsp; this piece is an example of how Wahrāmian propaganda was reworked to express "Messianic" hopes after the Arab onslaught²¹¹.

94. When he brings the treasure into his hand, he prepares the army and troops to Zābul, and advances against his enemies.

95. When the news reaches his enemies, Turk and Arab and Roman will come together, saying: "I will seize the King of PadišxYārgar and I will take that treasure and wealth from that man".

96. Then that man when he hears the news, with a large army and troops of Zābul will come to the center of the Iranian countries and with those men on that plain, where you, O Wištāsp, fought²¹² with the White Xyōns in the White Forest, they will struggle in battle with the King of PadišxYārgar.

To resume: the Arabs as referred to in 12-19, 51-57, 73, 95; pieces going back to the Wahrāmian propaganda are traceable in 58-62 and perhaps in 39-43 and 94-96. Thus, mostly the same pieces underwent the process of adding new material.

Thus, in this Chapter IV some most important Pahlavi passages of [pseudo-]historical character, disguised as apocalyptic prophecies, but being, in fact, mostly political propaganda, were studied. As was demonstrated, these passages, as a rule, go back to some particular Zands, and in the bulk of the cases, a scriptural history can be traced; the passages in question can be generally dated, more or less precisely.

²¹⁰ Cf. below.

²¹¹ Cf. Czeglédý 1957 & 1958.

²¹² The past tense form used indicates that the setting of that fragment is different from that given in AyZ, where the minister prophesizes before the battle.

SUMMARY

It is only now that the Zands begin to be studied systematically, and there is little doubt that Zand studies will become prominent in the years to come.

Different attitudes of the Sasanian exegesis reveal remarkable similarities to some levels of Jewish (and Nestorian) hermeneutics, such as *pāšāf*, *remez*, *midraš aggāqāh*, etc., and I believe that a comparative study of these parallels in veins of interpretation of sacred texts is desirable.

Zand underwent a long development from a word-by-word interlinear translation (in Iranian vernaculars older than our extant Pahlavi Zand) aiming to provide an auxiliary tool for grasping better the meaning of the Avestan "text" in times when Avestan was still comprehensible to some degree, until Zands became disconnected from their Avestan sources and began the existence of their own. The Avestan language became understandable less and less, and its *manthric* value became more prominent. The growing unintelligibility of the Avestan "texts" provided them with an additional dimension of sanctity, as the obscurity was ascribed to the fact that they contain the complete wisdom which cannot be grasped.

In order to illuminate some of the aspects of this complete wisdom, three veins of reading the Pahlavi Yasna were developed, corresponding to the triple division of the Avesta and to the tree types of religiosity (which may, or may not, reflect the older triple division into classes). These three levels of possible reading of the Pahlavi Yasna were summarized in Dk 9.

On the other hand, the Pahlavi Yasna itself became saturated with glosses, which in some case became integral parts of the Zand and supplied it with new tendencies.

These two parallel and inter-related processes brought about actual drifting apart of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts; still, one should appreciate the accuracy of the Zandic tradition.

General
Avvestan
Ind Indic (=Old Indian, Sanskrit)
Man Manichaean
Mir Middle Iranian
ManMP Manichaean Middle Persian
ManMPrt Manichaean Middle Persian
MP Middle Persian
NP New Persian
OIr Old Iranian
Phl Pahlavi
Texts and Journals
I.

AWN Ardāšīr Wīrāz Nāmāg
Ayu Ayādgār ī Jamāspīg
Bd Bundahishn
Dd Dādestān ī Dēnīg
Dk Dēnkard
DKD Dēnkard Dresden (MS B)
DKM Dēnkard Madan
DKS Dēnkard Sanjāna
GrBd Greater Bundahishn
IndBd Indian Bundahishn
IrBd Iranian Bundahishn
JN Jamāsp Nāmāg
KNAP Kārnāmāg ī Ardāšīr ī Pābagān
MX {Dādestān ī} Menōg ī Xrad
Phiyt Pahlavi Yast
PRDD Pahlavi Rivāyats accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg
PT Pahlavi Texts
PYd Pahlavi Vendidad/Vendidad
PY Pahlavi Yasna
RV Rgveda
SNS Sāyast ne Sāyast
Vd Vendidad/Vendīdād
WZS Wīzīdagīhā ī Zadspram
Y Yast
ZXA Zand-i Xurda Avesta
ZWY Zand ī Wahman Yasn/Yast

II.

AAASH Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
AION Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli
AiW: Bartholomae 1904: Bartholomae, Chr., Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg
AMi Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Berlin
AO Acta Orientalia, Havniae
AOASH Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
APAW Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin
BAI Bulletin of the Asia Institute
BSOS Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London
BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
CIS Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum
CRAIBL Comptes Rendues de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris
DISO Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions (Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest)
Eir Encyclopaedia Iranica, Costa Mesa, California
IJJ Indo-Iranian Journal
IOS Israeli Oriental Studies, Tel Aviv
JA Journal Asiatique
JAOS Journal of American Oriental Society, New Haven
JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JRAS Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London
JSAL Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, Jerusalem
MSS
RCArm Revue des Études Arméniennes, Paris
RHR Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Paris
RSO Rivista degli Studi Orientali
SBE Sacred Books of the East
SPAW Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin
StIr Studia Iranica
TPS Transactions of the Philological Society
VDI Bechnik Apešerēš Mētopm, Moskva
WZKM Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik

- Abayev 1971: Abayev, B.I., "Несколько замечаний к славянским этимологиям", Проблемы истории и диалектологии славянских языков, "Наука", Москва, 11-15
- Abayev 1976: Abayev, B.I., "Зороастер и Скифы", Acta Iranica 6, 1-12
- Abayev 1984: Abayev, V., "Avestica", Acta Iranica 23, 1-5
- Adam 1969: Adam, A., Texte zum Manichäismus, 2. verb. u. verm. Auflage, KIT 175, Berlin
- Albiruni, The Chronology of Ancient Nations, tr. by E. Sachau, London, 1879 [cf. Sachau 1879]
- Alexander 1983: Alexander, P., "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch", The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 1. Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Garden City, New York, 223-316
- Alfaric 1918: Alfaric, P., Les écritures manichéennes, Paris
- Altheim 1949: Altheim, F., Awestische Textgeschichte, Halle
- Altheim & Stiehl 1961: F. Altheim, F., und Stiehl, R., "Die zweite (aramäische) Inschrift von Mchēt'a", Forschungen und Fortschritte 35. Jahrgang (1961), 172-8
- Andreas 1903: Andreas, F.C., "Die Entstehung des Awesta-Alphabetes und sein ursprünglicher Lautwert", Verhandlungen des XII. Internationalen Orientalistenkongresses, Hamburg September 1902, Leiden, 93-97, 99-106
- Andreas & Wackernagel 1909, 1911, 1913, 1931: Andreas, F.C., und Wackernagel, J., "Yasna 28-32", NGWG, Phil.-hist.Kl. 1909 (42-9), 1911 (1-34), 1913 (363-85), 1931 (304-29)
- Andreas & Barr 1933: Andreas, F.C., und Barr, K., Bruchstücke einer Pehlevi-Übersetzung der Psalmen, SPAW, Phil.Hist. Klasse I, Berlin
- Anklesaria 1908: Anklesaria, T.D., The Būndahishn. Being a Facsimile of the TD Manuscript No. 2 brought from Persia by Dastur Tirandāz and now preserved in the late Ervad Tahmuras' Library, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1913a: Anklesaria, E.T.D., Dānāk-u Mainyō-i Khrd. Pahlavi. Pāzand and Sanskrit Texts, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1913b: Anklesaria, E.T.D., The Dadistan-i Dinik... Part I. Pursiṣn I-XI, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1949: Anklesaria, B.T., Pahlavi Vendidad (Zand-i Jvīt-Dēv-Dāt). Transliteration and Translation in English, ed. by Dinshah D. Kapadia, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1956: Anklesaria, B.T., Zand-Akāsīh, Iranian or Grater Bundahishn. Transliteration and Translation in English, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1957: Anklesaria, B.T., Zand-i Vohūman Yasn and two Pahlavi fragments with Text. Transliteration and Translation in English, Bombay

- Anklesaria 1958: Anklesaria, P.K., A Critical Edition of the Unedited Portion of the Dādestān-i Dēnik, London [unpubl.diss]
- Anklesaria 1964: Anklesaria, B.T., Yichitakiha-i Zatsparam, with Text and introduction, pt. I, Bombay
- Anklesaria 1970a: Anklesaria, P.K., The Bōdahesh. Being a Facsimile of the Manuscript TD 1, Tehran
- Anklesaria 1970b: Anklesaria, P.K., The Codex DH, Being a Facsimile Edition of Bōdahesh, Zand-e Vhuman Yasht, and Parts of Denkard, Tehran
- Antia 1909: Antia, E.E.K., Pāzand Texts. Collected and Collated, Bombay
- Asmussen 1965: Asmussen, J.P., Xvāstvānift. Studies in Manichaeism, Acta Theologica Danica VII, Copenhagen
- Asmussen 1968: Asmussen J.P., "Iranica", AO 31, 9-20
- Asmussen 1969: Asmussen, J.P., "The Death of Cambyses. DB 1,43 Uvāmašīyus", Bulletin of the Iranian Culture Foundation I, Teheran, 21-27
- Asmussen 1975: Asmussen, J. P., Manichaean Literature, Delmar, New York 1975
- Assmann 1992: Assmann, J., "Akhanyati's Theology of Light and Time", The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Proceedings VII.4, Jerusalem, 142-176
- Bacher 1900: Bacher, W., Ein hebräisch-persisches Wörterbuch aus dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert, Strassburg
ליקוטים ספר חטליצה הוא ספר פתרוני סלים אשר חבר ר' שכלמה בור' שמואל בשנת אהר"מ
אלפים תשעים משמע לבריאת העולם בעיר אורגנה בארץ תוגרסת חסידותית. בקום בניסין דאב באכאד
- Bahār 1345[h.s.] (1966): Bahār, M., Vāžanāma-yi Bundahīš, Intisārāt-i Bunyād-i Farhang-i Trān 17, Tehrān
- Bailey 1930-32a: Bailey, H.W., "To the Zāmāsp-Nāmak I-II", BSQS 6, 55-85, 581-601, with addenda, *ib.*, 822-4 & 948 [reprinted, without the Addenda, in Bailey 1981, Opera Minora I, ed. M. Nawabi, Shiraz, 22-55, 57-76]
- Bailey 1930-32b: Bailey, H.W., "The Word 'but' in Iranian", BSQS 6, 279-283
- Bailey 1930-32c: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian Studies I", BSQS 6, 945-955
- Bailey 1933-5a: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian Studies II", BSQS 7, 69-86
- Bailey 1933-5b: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian Studies III", BSQS 7, 275-298
- Bailey 1933-5c: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian Studies IV", BSQS 7, 755-778
- Bailey 1943: Bailey, H.W., Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books, Oxford / London (1943; 2 ed. 1971; cf. also Bailey 1971)
- Bailey 1943a: Bailey, H.W., "Caucasica", JRAS, 1-5

- Bailey 1953: Bailey, H.W., "Analecta Indoscythica I", JRAS, 95-116
- Bailey 1954: Bailey, H.W., "Hārāhūnā", Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller. Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern, Leipzig, 12-21
- Bailey 1963: Bailey, H.W., "Arya IV", BSQAS 26, 69-91
- Bailey 1970: Bailey, H.W., "APPENDIX: *Kōmīs*", JRAS, 61-62
- Bailey 1971: Bailey, H.W., Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books, Oxford / London [2 ed. 1971; 1st ed. 1943; cf. also Bailey 1943]
- Bailey 1974: Bailey, H.W., "The Range of the Colour *zar-* in Khotan Saka Texts", Mémoires de Menasce, ed. Ph. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, Fondation Culturelle Iranienne 185, 369-374
- Bailey 1975: Bailey, H.W., "Report", Mithraic Studies, ed. J.R. Hinnells, Manchester, 134
- Bailey 1976: Bailey, H.W., "Nāṣā and Fāṣā", Acta Iranica 6, 309-312
- Bailey 1979: Bailey, H.W., Dictionary of Khotan Saka, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-London-New York-Melbourne
- Bailey 1980: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian MKTK-, Armenian MKTREM", REArm NS 14, 7-10
- Bailey 1985a: Bailey, H.W., "*Apastāk*", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 9-14
- Bailey 1985b: Bailey, H.W., "Plant Names", The Cambridge History of Iran 2. The Median, and Achaemenian Periods, edited by Ilya Gershevitch, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., B70-3
- Bailey 1988a: Bailey, H.W., "Zoroastrian *Frast* 'Fortune'", Cahier de Studia Iranica 7, 19-21
- Bailey 1988b: "Gard-āman", Acta Iranica 28 (*Hommages et Opera Minora XII, A Green Leaf*, پاپرک در یادگار استاد ج. پ. اسمussen, *Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*), Leiden, 61-62
- Bailey 1990: Bailey, H.W., "Iranian *Kēt* 'Foreteller' and Related Words", Acta Iranica 30, 6-9
- Bailey, H.W., The Orbit of Afghan studies. A Lecture Given at the Society's [the Society for Afghan Studies] Inaugural Meeting [offprint; no date]
- Bang 1925: Bang, W., "Manichäische Hymnen", Le Muséon 28.1-2, 1-55
- Bartholomae 1904: Bartholomae, Chr., Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Strassburg [cf. AiW]
- Bausani 1971: Bausani, A., The Persians from the Earliest Days to the Twentieth Century, London
- Belardi 1979: Belardi, W., The Pahlavi Book of the Righteous Viraz, Rome
- Belova 1987: Белова, А.Г., "Химьяритский язык по арабским источникам", Проблемы арабской культуры. Памяти академика И.Ю. Крачковского, "Наука", Москва, 154-162
- Benfey 1858: Benfey, Th., "Ein persisches Amulett mit einer Pehlewi-Inschrift. Avesta", ZDMG 12, 567-583

- Ben Hayyim 1968: Ben Hayyim, Z., "The Contribution of the Samaritan Inheritance to Research into the History of Hebrew", Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Science and Humanities III.6, 162-174
- Benveniste 1930: Benveniste, É., "Nomes sogdiens dans un texte pehlevi de Turfan", JA 217, 291-295
- Benveniste 1932: Benveniste, É., "Une apocalypse pehlevie: Le *Zāmāsp-Nāmak*", RHR 106, 337-80
- Benveniste 1932-33: Benveniste, É., "Le témoignage de Théodore bar Kōnay sur le zoroastrisme", Le Monde Oriental 26-27, 170-215
- Benveniste 1938: Benveniste, É., "Traditions indo-iraniennes sur les classes sociales", JA 230, 529-549
- Benveniste 1970: Benveniste, É., "Que signifie *Videvdāt*?", W.B. Henning Memorial Volume, ed. by M. Boyce & I. Gershevitch, London, 37-42
- Benzing 1968: Benzing, J., Das Chwaresmische Sprachmaterial einer Handschrift der "Mugaddamat al-Adab" von Zamaxshari, Wiesbaden
- Beyer 1984: Beyer, K., Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, Göttingen
- Bharucha 1912: Bharucha, S.D., Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsis, Bombay
- Bianchi 1958: Bianchi, U., Zamān i Ohrmazd. Lo zoroastrismo nelle sue origine e nella sua essenza, Torino
- Bickerman 1938: Bickerman, E.J., Institutions des Seleucides, Paris
- Bickerman 1976: Бикерман, Э., Хронология древнего мира. Древний Восток и античность, Москва [a revised version of Bickerman 1969: Bickerman, E.J., Chronology of the Ancient World, London]
- Bidez & Cumon 1938: Bidez, J., & Cumont, F., Les Mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanès et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque 1-2, Paris
- Bielmeier 1985: Bielmeier, R., "Zu iranischen Lehnwörter im Georgischen und Armenischen", Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen, Festschrift für Johann Knobloch, ed. by H.M. Ölberg, G. Schmidt, H. Botli, Insbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 23, Innsbruck, 33-42
- Bivar 1988: Bivar, A.D.H., "An Iranian Sarapis", BAI 2, 11-17
- Bivar 1996: A.D.H., "The Royal Hunter and the Hunter God: Esoteric Mithraism under the Sasanians?", Res Orientalia VII: Moven Orient: Carrefour des grandes religions. Volume in Honour of Philippe Gignoux, Paris, 29-38
- Bloch 1895: Blochet, E., "Textes religieux pehlvis", RHR 31, 241-253 (1-10)
- Bloch 1898: Blochet, E., "Le livre intitulé l'Ōulamā-i Islām", RHR 37, 23-49
- de Blois 1990: de Blois, F., Burzoy's Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book of Kalīlah wa Dimnah, Royal Asiatic Society, Prize Publication Fund, Vol. XXIII, London

de Blois 1993a: de Blois, F., "Two Sources of the *Handarz of Ōšnar*", *Iran. Journal of Persian Studies* 31, 95-7

de Blois 1993b: de Blois, F., "'Place' and 'Throne' in Persian", *Iran. Journal of Persian Studies* 33, 61-6

de Blois 1995: de Blois, F., "The 'Sabians' (Ṣābi'ūn) in Pre-Islamic Arabia", *Acta Orientalia*, 39-61

Bogoliubov 1971: Боголюбов, М.Н., "Молитва Ахурамазде на древнеиранском языке среди арамейских надписей из Аребсуна", *История Иранского Государства и Культуры. К 2500-летию Иранского Государства*, "Наука", Москва, 277-285

Bosworth 1990: Bosworth, C.E., "Al-Khwarazmi on Various Faiths and Sects, Chiefly Iranian", *Acta Iranica* 30, 10-18

Boyce 1949-51: Boyce, M., "Sadwes and Pesus", *BSOAS* 13, 908-915

Boyce 1954: Boyce, M., *The Manichaean Hymn-cycles in Parthian*, London Oriental Series 3, Oxford

Boyce 1960: Boyce, M., *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*, DAW Inst. f. Orientalforschung №.45, Berlin

Boyce 1968a: Boyce, M., "Middle Persian Literature", *Handbuch der Orientalistik, vierter Band, Iranistik, zweiter Abschnitt, Lieferung*, Leiden / Köln, 31-66

Boyce 1968b: Boyce, M., *The Letter of Tansar*, Serie Orientale Roma XXVIII, Persian Heritage Series. *Literary and Historical Texts from Iran*, Roma

Boyce 1970: Boyce, M., "On the Calendar of Zoroastrian Feasts", *BSOAS* 33, 513-539

Boyce 1975a: Boyce, M., *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Acta Iranica, 2^e Série, 2, Leiden

Boyce 1975b: Boyce, M., *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*, Manchester

Boyce 1975c: Boyce, M., *A History of Zoroastrianism I*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Leiden

Boyce 1975d: Boyce, M., "The Zoroastrian Temple Cult of Fire", *JACS* 95, 454-65

Boyce 1977: Boyce, M., *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Acta Iranica 9a, Leiden

Boyce 1983a: Boyce, M., "Iranian Festivals", *The Cambridge History of Iran 3(2). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 792-818

Boyce 1983b: Boyce, M., "Parthian Writings and Literature", *The Cambridge History of Iran 3(2). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 1151-1165

Boyce 1983c: Boyce, M., "Manichaean Middle Persian Writings", *The Cambridge History of Iran 3(2). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 1196-1204

Boyce 1984a: Boyce, M., *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism*, Manchester

Boyce 1984b: Boyce, M., "On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic", *BSOAS* XLVII, 57-75

Boyce 1985a: Boyce, M., "Ādur Burzēn-Mihr", *EIr* 1, 472-3

Boyce 1985b: Boyce, M., "Ādur Farnbāg", *EIr* 1, 473-5

Boyce 1985c: Boyce, M., "Ādur Gušnasp", *EIr* 1, 475-6

Boyce 1987a: Бойс, М., *Зороастрийцы. Верования и обычаи*, "Наука", Москва [ed. by E. Grantovskij, translated by I. Steblin-Kamenskij, from Boyce 1979, M., *Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London]

Boyce 1987b: Boyce, M., "*Avātkār I Jāmāspīd*", *EIr* 12 ed. E. Yarshater, London & New York, 127-8

Boyce 1987c: Boyce, M., "Apocalyptic. I. Zoroastrianism", *EIr* 2, ed. E. Yarshater, London & New York, 154-7

Boyce 1988: Boyce, M., "The Lady and the Scribe: Some Further Reflections on Anāhīt and Tīr", *Acta Iranica* 28 (*Hommages et Opera Minora, Volume XII, A Green Leaf*, *سبز برگ*, *Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*), Leiden, 277-282

Boyce 1989: Boyce, M., "The Poems of the Persian Sibyl", *Cahier de Studia Iranica* 7 (*Études iraniennes arymenes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*), 59-77

Boyce & Grenet 1991: Boyce, M., and Grenet, F., *The History of Zoroastrianism III, Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abteilung, 8. Band, 1. Abschnittlieferung, 2. Heft*, Leiden Brill

Boyce 1996: Boyce, M., "Dog II. In Zoroastrianism", *EIr* 7, 467-9

Browne 1956: Browne, E.G., *A Literary History of Persia I*, London

de Bruijn 1990: de Bruijn, J.T.P., "Iran. vi. Religions", *The Encyclopaedia of Islam New Edition* IV, second impression, Leiden, 43-52

Brunner 1987: Brunner, C.J., "Anōšag-ruwān", *EIr* 2, 98-99

Bulsara 1915: Bulsara, S.J., *Aērpatāstān and Nirangistān, English Translation with Notes*, Bombay

Burrow 1973: Burrow, T., "The Proto-Indoaryans", *JRAS*, 123-140

Calmeyer & Gaube 1985: Calmeyer, P., & Gaube, H., "Eine edlere Frau als sie habe ich nie gesehen", *Acta Iranica* 24 (*dixième série, Hommages et Opera Minora X. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 43-60

Cameron 1968: Cameron, G.G., "Zoroaster the Herdsman", *IJL* 10, 261-281

Carter 1990: Carter, M.L., "Early Sasanian and Kushano-Sasanian Coinage from Merv", *BAI NS* 4, 11-16

Casadio 1993: Casadio, G., "Mani versus Mazdak: The Prophet and His King in pre-Islamic Iran", Religious Transformations and Socio-Political Change. Eastern Europe and Latin America, ed. L. Marthin, Berlin, New York, 41-60

Casartelli 1885: Casartelli, L.C.C., "Une traité pehlevi sur la médecine", Le Muséon 5, 296-316, 531-558 [reprinted *separatim* Louvain, 1886] (*non vidi*)

Casartelli 1889/90: Casartelli, L.C., "Astodans, and the Avestic Funeral Prescriptions", The Babylonian and Oriental Record IV.7, 145-152

Casartelli 1900: Casartelli, L.C.C., "Versions orientales du Pater-Noster", Le Muséon N.S. 1 (1900), 253-254

Cereti 1994: Cereti, C., "Appunti preliminari allo studio del quattro libro del *Dēnkard*", Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese 33-34 (1992-1993), 232-243

Cereti 1994: Cereti, C., "Zoroastrian Pahlavi Literature as a Source for Central-Asian Geography", The Archeology of the Steppes. Methods and Strategies. Papers from the International Symposium held in Naples 9-12 November 1992, Istituto Universitario Orientale. Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor XLIV, Napoli, 447-466

Cereti 1995: Cereti, C., The Zand ī Wahman Yasn. A Zoroastrian Apocalypse, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Serie Orientale Roma fondata da Giuseppe Tucci diretta da Gherardo Gnoli Vol. LXXV, Roma

Cereti 1997: Cereti, C., "Studi preliminari sull'ottavo libro del *Dēnkard*", Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, anno CCCXIV, serie IX - volume VIII - fascicolo 1, Roma, 95-117

Chavannes 1903: Chavannes, É., Documents sur les T'ou-Kioue (Turcs) Occidentaux, *Сборникъ трудовъ орхонской Экспедиции. VI.*, St.-Petersbourg.

Chavannes & Pelliot 1911-13: Chavannes, E., & Pelliot, P., "Un Traité Manichéen Retrouvé en Chine, traduit et annoté", JA Novembre-Décembre 1911, 499-617 [=1-121] et Janvier-Avril 1913, 99-394 [=123-360]

Christensen 1915: Christensen, A., Smeden Kāvāh og det persiske Rigsbanner, *Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 2.7, København

Christensen 1918: Christensen, A., Les types du premier homme et du premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des iraniens, *Archives d'Études Orientales* 14, Stockholm

Christensen 1925: Christensen, A., Le règne du roi Kawādh I et le communisme mazdakite, *Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser* 9.6, København

Christensen 1931: Christensen, A., "Introduction", The Pahlavi Codices K20 & K20b. First Part. Codices Avestici et Pahlavici Bibliothecae Universitatis Hafniensis, v. I, København

Christensen 1943: Christensen, A., Le premier chapitre du Vendidad et l'histoire primitive des tribus iranniennes, *Det Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser*, 29.2, København

Christensen 1944: Christensen, A., L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen, 2nd edition

von le Coq 1911: von Le Coq, A., "Dr. Stein's Turkish Khuastuanift from Tun-Huang, being a Confession-Prayer of the Manichæan Auditores", JRAS, 278-314

Corbin 1977: Corbin, H., Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth. From Mazdean Iran to Shi'ite Iran (Terre céleste et corps de résurrection: de l'Iran mazdéen à l'Iran shi'ite), 1960, Paris), Princeton

Crone 1991: Crone, P., "Kavad's Heresy and Mazdak's Revolt", IRAN. Journal of Persian Studies 29, 21-42

Cumont 1908: Cumont, F., Recherches sur le Manichéisme I. La Cosmogonie Manichéenne d'après Théodore bar Khōni, Bruxelles 1908

Cunakova & Ščervanovskij 1982: Чунакова, О.М., Щервановский, А.Л., "О дате редакции "Книги Деяний Ардашира, сына Папака", VDI 3, 136-145

Cunakova 1987: Чунакова, О.М., Книга Деяний Ардашира Сына Папака, "Наука", Москва
Книга Деяний Ардашира Сына Папака, "Наука", Москва

Cunakova 1991: Чунакова, О.М., Изведать дороги и пути праведных. Пехлевийские назидательные тексты, "Наука", Москва

Cunakova 1997: Чунакова, О.М., Зороастрийские тексты. Суждения Духа Разума (Дадестан-и меног-и храд). Сотворение Основы (Бундахишн) и Другие тексты, "Восточная литература", Москва

Cureton 1923: Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects by Muhammad al-Shahrastāni. Now First Edited from the Collation of Several MSS by the Rev. William Cureton, Leipzig (reprint from the edition: London, 1846)

Czeglédy 1957: Czeglédy, K., "Bahrām Čōbīn", Antik Tanulmányok IV", 301-333

Czeglédy 1958: Czeglédy, K., "Bahrām Čōbīn and the Persian Apocalyptic Tradition", AOASh 3, 21-43

Darmesteter 1880: Darmesteter, J., The Zand-Avesta. Part I (The Vendīdād), Oxford University Press [reprint: Sacred Books of the East, IV, Delhi etc., 1974]

Darmesteter 1883: Darmesteter, J., Études iraniennes I-II, Paris

Darmesteter 1887: Darmesteter, J., "L'Apocalypse persane de Daniel", Mélanges Renier-Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études 73, 405-420

Darmesteter 1889a: Darmesteter, J., "Texts Pehlvis Relatifs au Judaïsme", REJ 18, 1-15

Darmesteter 1889b: Darmesteter, J., "Texts Pehlvis Relatifs au Judaïsme", REJ 19, 41-56

Darmester 1892-3: Darmester, J., Le Zend-Avesta. traduction nouvelle avec commentaire historique et philologique I-III, Paris

Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp 1907: Vendidad. Avesta Text with Pahlavi Translation and Commentary and Glossarial Index, edited by Shams-ul-Ulma, Sirdar, Khan Bahadur Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp, Parsi High-Priest of the Deccan, etc., with the Assistance of Mervanji Manekji Gandevia, M.A., Vol. I - The Texts, Bombay

Davidson 1985: Davidson, O.M., "The Crown-Bestower in the Iranian Book of Kings", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 61-148

Dehdašt 1363[h.š.] (1985): Dehdašt, A., Pažuheš dar matn-i pehlevī-vi sīrūze-i kūček sīrūze-i bozorg, Tehrān

Dehghan 1982: Dehghan, K., Der Avesta-Text Sroš Yašt (Yasna 57) mit Pahlavi- und Sanskritübersetzung, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 11, NF, München

Destré 1971: Destré, A., "Quelques réflexions sur le héros des récits apocalyptiques persanes et sur le mythe de la ville de cuivre", Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 marzo - 5 aprile 1970), Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLXVIII - 1971, Quaderno N.160, Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 639-654

Dhabhar 1927: Dhabhar, E.B.N., Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk, Bombay

Dhabhar 1932: Dhabhar, E.B.N., The Persian Rivayats of Hormazyar Framarz and Others. Their Version with Introduction and Notes, Bombay

Dhabhar 1949: Dhabhar, E.B.N., Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad, Bombay

Dhabhar 1963: Dhabhar, E.B.N., Translation of Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk, The K.R.Cama Oriental Institute, Bombay

Dhalla 1965: Dhalla, M.N., The Nyaishes or Zoroastrian Litanies, New York

Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, by J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, with appendices by R.C. Steiner, A. Mosak Moshavi and B. Porten, I, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung. Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Einundzwanzigster Band, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995 (Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest) [cf. DISO]

Djakonov & Livshits 1966: Дьяконов, И.М., и Лившиц, В.А., "Новые находки документов в Старой Нисе", Переднеазиатский сборник II. Дешифровка и интерпретация письменностей Древнего Востока, "Наука", Москва, 133-157

Djakonov 1986: Дьяконов, И.М., "О гетерогении и её месте в истории развития письма (Месопотамия и Иран)", Переднеазиатский Сборник IV, Moscow, 4-18

Dodge 1970: Dodge, B., The Fihrist of al-Nadīm. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture, 2 vol., Columbia University Press, New York & London

Donner & Röllig 1971-76: Donner, H., und Röllig, W., Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, Dritte Ausgabe, Hl, Wiesbaden

Dresden 1966: Dresden, M.J., Denkard, A Pahlavi Text. Facsimile Edition of the Manuscript B of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute Bombay, Wiesbaden

Dresden 1970: Dresden, M.J., "Indo-Iranian Notes: 1. Avestan ravδ.fraoθman-; 2. Avestan uzgastō; 3. Iranian Optative Forms", W.B. Henning Memorial Volume, ed. by M. Boyce & I. Gershevitch, London, 134-139

Drower & Macuch 1963: Drower, E.S., & Macuch, R., The Mandaic Dictionary, Oxford

Duchesne-Guillemin 1949-51: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "Yasna 45 and the Iranian Calendar", BSOAS 13, 635-640

Duchesne-Guillemin 1953: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "Les noms des eunuques d'Assuérus", Le Muséon 116, 105-8

Duchesne-Guillemin 1962: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., La religion de l'Iran ancien, Presses universitaires de France, Paris

Duchesne-Guillemin 1963: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "Le 'x'varənah'", AKN 15, 19-31

Duchesne-Guillemin 1964: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "The 'Form of Fire'", Dr. J. M. Unvala Memorial Volume, Bombay, 14-17

Duchesne-Guillemin 1966: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "D'Anaximandre à Empédocle: contacts gréco-iraniens", La Persia e il mondo greco-romano, Accademia nazionale dei lincei qu. N.76, Roma, 423-431

Duchesne-Guillemin 1979: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "Cor de Yima et trompette d'Isrā'īl: de la cosmogonie mazdéenne à l'eschatologie musulmane", CRAI, 539-549

Duchesne-Guillemin 1982: Duchesne-Guillemin, J., "Apocalypse juive et apocalypse iranienne", La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero romano, eds. U. Bianchi and M. Vermaseren, Leiden, 753-61

Dumézil 1926: Dumézil, G., "Le fleurs Haurot-Maurot et les anges Haurvatāt-Amerētāt", REA 6.2, 43-69

Dumézil 1945: Dumézil, G., Naissance d'Archanges, Paris

Ecsedy 1971: Ecsedy, I., "A Middle Persian - Chinese Epitaph from the Region of Ch'ang-An (Hsian) from 874", AAASH 19, 149-158

Ecsedy 1979: Ecsedy, I., "Early Persian Envoys in Chinese Courts", Studies in the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia, ed. J. Harmatta, Budapest, 153-162 (=AAASH 25, 1977, 227-36)

Eddy 1961: Eddy, S.K., The King is Dead. Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C., Lincoln NB

Eilers 1983: Eilers, W., "Iran and Mesopotamia", The Cambridge History of Iran 3(1). The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 481-504

Flattery 1979: Flattery, D.S., Haoma. With Contributions by Martin Schwartz, Berkeley [typewritten copy]

Flügel 1862: Flügel, G., Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften, Leipzig

Flügel 1871: Flügel, G., Kitāb al-Fihrist, hrsg. v. J. Roediger, Leipzig

Flusser 1972: Flusser, D., "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel", Israel Oriental Studies 2, 148-75

Flusser 1972: Flusser, D., "Gathas in a Sibylline Oracle", Studies in the History of Religions XXI Ex Orbe Religionum, vol. I, ed. J. Bergman, K. Drynjev and H. Ringgren, 172-5 [cf. Judaism and the Origins of Christianity, Magnes Press, Jerusalem (1988), 355-8]

Flusser 1982: Flusser, D., "Hystaspes and John of Patmos", Irano-Judaica, ed. Sh. Shaked, Jerusalem, 153-183 [cf. also Flusser, D., Judaism and the Origins of Christianity, Magnes Press, Jerusalem (1988), 390-453]

Flusser 1988: Flusser, D., "A Quotation from the Gathas in a Christian Sibylline Oracle", Judaism and the Origins of Christianity, The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 355-358 (172-175) vrs 439-455 DMX

Frejman 1930: Фрейман, А., "Название Черного моря в домусульманской Персии", Записки Коллегии Востоковедов V/Mémoires du Comité des Orientalistes, Leningrad, 647-651

Frendo 1993: Frendo, D., "Sasanian Irredentism and the Foundation of Constantinople: Historical Truth and Historical Reality", BAI 6, 59-66

Frye 1971: Frye, R.N., "History and Sasanian Inscriptions", Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 marzo - 5 aprile 1970), Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLXVIII - 1971, Quaderno N.160, Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 215-223

Frye 1983: Frye, R.N., "The Political History of Iran Under the Sasanians", The Cambridge History of Iran 3(1), The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 116-180

Frye 1984: Frye, R.N., "Historical Problems in Middle Iranian Sources", Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982, ed. W. Skalmowski & A. van Tongerloo, Leuven, 263-268

Frye 1985: Frye, R.N., "Two Iranian Notes", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 185-190

Frye 1992: Frye, R., "Manichaean Notes", Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongress zum manichäismus 6.-10. august 1989, Studies in Oriental Religions Vol. 23, ed. G. Wießner & H.-J. Klimkeit, Wiesbaden, 93-97

Geiger 1956: Geiger, B., "The Middle Iranian Texts", in: Kraeling, C.H., The Excavations at Dura Europos, vol. VIII, *The Synagogue*, New Haven, 283-317

Gershevitch 1959: Gershevitch, I., The Avestan Hymn to Mithra, London

Gershevitch 1964: Gershevitch, I., "Zoroaster's Own Contribution", JNES 23, 12-38

Gershevitch 1969: Gershevitch, I., "Amber at Persepolis", Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata II, Rome, 167-251

Gershevitch 1976a: Gershevitch, I., "Appendix" (*apud* Nicholas Sims-Williams 1976, "The Sogdian Fragments of the British Library", Indo-Iranian Journal 3, 43-82), 75-82

Gershevitch 1976b: Gershevitch, I., "More Meat in Iranian", Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics, Offered to L. Palmer, ed. A. Morpurgo-Davies and W. Meid, Innsbruck, 64-65

Gershevitch 1980a: Gershevitch, I., "The Bactrian Fragment in Manichaean Script", Acta Antiqua ASH 28, 273-280

Gershevitch 1980b: Gershevitch, I., "Beauty as the Living Soul in Iranian Manicheism", Acta Antiqua ASH 28, 281-288

Gershevitch 1984: Gershevitch, I., "An Avestan Recovery through Sogdian", East and West, NS 34 (1-3), 43-45

Gershevitch 1986: Gershevitch, I., "mazādsčā ahurānghō", Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für H. Humbach, ed. R. Schmitt & P. O. Skjaervø, München, 83-101

Gershevitch 1987: Gershevitch, I., "Yima's Beef-Plea", Orientalia Iosephi Tucci memoria dicata II, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente - Serie Orientale Roma, LVI, 2, ed. G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, Roma, 487-99

Gershevitch 1995: Gershevitch, I., "Approaches to Zoroaster's Gathas", Iran 33, 1-29

Ghilain 1947: Ghilain, A., "Un feuillet manichéen reconstitué", Le Muséon LXI, 535-45

Ghirshman 1962: Ghirshman, R., "La civilisation achéménide et l'Urartu", A Locust Leg. Studies in Honour of S.H. Tagizadeh, London, 85-88

Ghirshman 1965: Ghirshman, R., "Le Triomphe de Châpour I", MIO 11, 3-6

Gignoux 1969: Gignoux, Ph., "L'auteur de la version pehlevi du Psautier serait-il nestorien?", Memorial Mgr Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis, Louvain, 233-244

Gignoux 1980: Gignoux, Ph., "Sceaux chrétiens d'époque sassanide", Iranica Antiqua 15, 299-314

Gignoux 1981, Ph., "Les voyages chamaniques dans le monde iranien", Acta Iranica 21 (*Monumentum G. Morgenstern* I), 244-65

Gignoux & Gyselen 1982: Gignoux, Ph., & Gyselen, R., Sceaux sassanides de divers collections privées, *Cahier de Studia Iranica* 7, Leuven

Gignoux 1984a: Gignoux, Ph., Le Livre d'Ardā Virāz. Transliteration, transcription et traduction du texte pehlevi, *Institut Français d'Iranologie de Téhéran, Bibliothèque Iranienne* 30, Paris

Gignoux 1984b: Gignoux, Ph., "Der Grossmagier Kirdīr und seine Reise in das Jenseits", Acta Iranica 23, *Hommages et Opera Minora IX, Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin Emerito Oblata*, Leiden, 191-206

Gignoux 1986a: Gignoux, Ph., "Sur l'inexistence d'un Bahman Yasht Avestique", Journal of Asian and African Studies 32, Tokyo, 53-64

Gignoux 1986b: Gignoux, Ph., "Nouveaux Regards sur l'Apocalyptique Iranienne", CRAI 1986 (*Comptes rendus. Académie des inscriptions & belles-lettres, Mai 1987*), 334-346

Gignoux 1985-8: Gignoux, Ph., "L'apocalyphtique iranienne est-elle vraiment la source d'autres apocalypses?", AAASH 31, 67-78

Gignoux 1986-7: Gignoux, Ph., "Recherches sur l'apocalyphtique iranienne: explication du Zand i Vohuman Yasn", Annuaire des résumés des conférences et travaux. École pratique des hautes études XCV, 201-5

Gignoux 1987a: Gignoux, Ph., "Apocalypses et voyages extra-terrestres dans l'Iran mazdéen", Apocalypses et voyages dans l'au-delà, ed. C. Kappler, Paris, 351-74

Gignoux 1987b: Gignoux, Ph., "Anērān", EIr 12, 30-31

Gignoux 1988: Gignoux, Ph., "L'Apocalypstique iranienne est-elle vraiment la source d'autres apocalypses?", AAASH 31, 67-78

Gignoux 1991a: Gignoux, Ph., "D'Abnūn à Māhān", Studia Iranica 20, 9-22

Gignoux 1991b: Gignoux, Ph., Les quatre inscriptions du mage Kirdīr. Textes et concordances. Collections de sources pour l'histoire de l'Asie Centrale pré-islamique Série II, vol. I (Studia Iranica, Cahier 9), Paris

Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993: Anthologie de Zādspram. Edition critique du texte pehlevi traduit et commenté par Ph. Gignoux et A. Tafazzoli, Studia Iranica - Cahier 13, Paris

Gignoux 1996a: Gignoux, Ph., "Dēnkard", EIr 7, 284-289

Gignoux 1996b: Gignoux, Ph., "À propos de Yashts avestiques", Studia Iranica 25.2, 233-239

Gikyō Itō 1974: Gikyō Itō, "Gathica XII. On the Meaning of 'Avestā'", Orient 10, Tokyo, 1-10

Gikyō Itō 1991: Gikyō Itō, "Pahlavī hapax legomena 'wlyt', 'wlyt'yk, 'wlytyk (Pahlavica XIV)" Orient 28, 36-43

Di Giovine 1989: Di Giovine, P., Il riflesso pahlavico del nome avestico dell' "eretico", Università della Basilicata, Istituto di Linguistica, Potenza

Gnoli 1967: Gnoli, Gh., Ricerche storiche sul Sīstān antico, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente - Reports and Memoirs X, Roma

Gnoli 1975: Gnoli, Gh., "Zur Sīstān-Hypothese", Acta Iranica 4, 277-290

Gnoli 1980: Gnoli, Gh., Zoroaster's Time and Homeland. A Study on the Origins of Mazdeism and Related Problems, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor VII, Naples

Gnoli 1985: Gnoli, Gh., "Er Mazdēsn Zum Begriff Iran und seiner Entstehung im 3. Jahrhundert", Transition Periods in Iranian History (Actes du Symposium de Fribourg en Brisgau), 83-100

Gnoli 1986: Gnoli, Gh., "Mitteliranisch ēr 'Iranier'", Studia Grammatica Iranica (Festschrift für H. Humbach, ed. R. Schmidt & P. O. Skjærø), München, 115-124

Gnoli 1987: Gnoli, Gh., "Βασίλειος βασιλέων Ἀριωνῶν", Orientalia Iosephi Tucci memoria dicata II, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Serie Orientale Roma, LVI, 2, ed. G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, Roma,

Gnoli 1989a: Gnoli, Gh., The Idea of Iran. An Essay on its Origin, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Serie Orientale Roma fondata da Giuseppe Tucci diretta da Gherardo Gnoli Vol. LXII, Roma

Gnoli 1989b: Gnoli, Gh., "Bahrām. i. In Old and Middle Iranian Texts", EIr 3, 511-3

Gnoli 1993: Gnoli, Gh., "A Sassanian Iconography of the *Dēn*", BAI NS 7, 79-85

Gnoli 1994a: Gnoli, Gh., "Tendenze attuali negli studi zoroastriani", The Notion of "Religion" in Comparative Research. Selected Proceedings of the XVI IAHR Congress, ed. by U. Bianchi, Storia delle religioni, "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 55-62

Gnoli 1994b: Gnoli, Gh., "Über die Daēnā: *Haðōxt nask* 2, 7-9", Tradition und Translation. Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. by Chr. Elsas et al., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin - New York, 292-298

de Goeje 1894: de Goeje, M.J., [ed.], Mas'ūdī. Abū'l-Hasan. Kitābu'l-Tanbīh wa'l-I'tisāf, Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum 8, Leiden

Golden 1984: Golden, P.B., "Khazaria and Judaism", Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 4, 126-156

Gray 1904: Gray, L.H., "Kai Lohrasp and Nebuchadrezzar", WZKM 18, 291-298

Gray 1905: Gray, L.H., "Pahlavi Literature, Jews in", The Jewish Encyclopedia IX, New York - London, 462-5

Gray 1906: Gray, L.H., "The Jews in Pahlavi Literature", Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des orientalistes, Alger 1905, première partie, Paris, 177-92

Gray 1929: Gray, L.H., The Foundations of the Iranian Religion, Bombay

Greenfield 1973: Greenfield, J.C., Prolegomenon to Enoch or the Hebrew Book Enoch, by. H. Odeberg, KTAV New York

Greenfield 1974, J.C., "Rtyn mgwš", Joshua Finkel festschrift, New York, 63-69

Greenfield 1975: Greenfield, J.C., "Iranian or Semitic?", Acta Iranica 4, 311-6

Greenfield 1980: Greenfield, J.C., "The Genesis Apocryphon - Observations on some Words and Phrases", Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, ed. G.B. Sarfatti, Pingas Artzi, Jonas C. Greenfield, Menahem Kaddari, Ramat-Gan, xxxii-xxxix

Greenfield & Stone 1979: Greenfield, J.C., and Stone, M.E., "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch", Numen 26, 89-103

Grenet 1989: Grenet, F., "Bactria. ii. In the Avesta and in Zoroastrian Tradition", EIr 3, 343-4

Gropp 1975: Gropp, G., "Die Derbent-Inschriften und das Adur Gušnasp, Acta Iranica 4, 317-311

Gumilev & Kuznetsov 1970: Gumilev, L.N., and Kuznetsov, B.L., "Two Tradition of Ancient Tibetan Cartography (Landscape and Ethnos, VIII)", Soviet Geography 11:7, 565-579 [from: Вестник Ленинградского Университета 24, 1969, 88-101]

Haarh 1968: Haarh, E., The Zhang-Zhung Language. A Grammar and Dictionary of the Unexplored Language of the Tibetan Bonpos, Acta Jutlandica XL:11, Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus, Einer Munksgaard, København

Hallock 1970: Hallock, R.T., "On the Old Persian Signs", JNES 29, 52-55

Haloun & Henning 1952-3: Haloun, G., & Henning, W.B., "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light", Asia Major 3.2, 184-212

Hambartsumian 1998: A. Амбарцумян, "О загадочном имени Кентавр Пюрида", Iran & Caucasus II, Research Papers from the Caucasian Centre for Iranian Studies, Yerevan, ed. by Garnik Asatrian, Teheran, 49-61

Hampel 1974: Hampel, J., Die Kopenhagener Handschrift Cod. 27. Eine Sammlung von zoroastrischen Gebeten, Beschwörungsformeln, Vorschriften und wissenschaftlichen Überlieferungen, Göttinger Orientalischen Veröffentlichungen des Sonderforschungsbereiches Orientalistik an der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, III. Reihe: Iranica, Wiesbaden

Harmatta 1984: Harmatta, J., "Mithridates I and the Rise of the Parthian Writing System", AAASH 29.1-4, 219-225

Hartman 1955: Hartman, S.S., "Yašts, jours et mois", Orientalia Suecana 4, 34-42

Hartman 1956: Hartman, S.S., "La disposition de l'Avesta", Orientalia Suecana 5, 30-77

Hartman 1966: Hartman, S.S., "Les identifications de Gayōmart au temps Islamique", Syncretism. Papers at the Symposium on Cultural Contact Meeting of Religions. Syncretism held at Abo on the 8th-10th of September, 1966, ed. by S. S. Hartman, Stockholm, 263-290

Hartman 1983a: Hartman, S.S., "Datierung der jungavestischen Apokalyphtik", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, Tübingen, 61-75

Hartman 1983b: Hartman, L., "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, Tübingen, 329-43

Haug 1878: Haug, M., The Parsis. Essays on their Sacred Language, Writings and Religion, München

Haug & West 1872: Haug, M., and West, E.W., The Book of Arda Viraf. The Pahlavi Text prepared by Destur Hoshangji Jamaspji Asa, revised and colated with further MSS., with an English Translation and Introduction, and an Appendix containing the texts and translations of the Gosh-ti Frynao, and Hadokht-Nask, Bombay-London

Hedāyat 1342h.š.: Hedāyat, Š., Zand-i Wohuman Yasn wa Kārnāmah-i Ardašīr-i Pāpakān, Tehrān

Hennecke 1973-4: Hennecke, E., [ed.], New Testament Apokrypha, London (W. Schneemelcher, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, Tübingen, 1924, herausgegeben von E. Hennecke)

Henning 1933a: Henning, W. B., "Das Vervum des mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente", ZII 9, 158-253

Henning 1933b: Henning, W. B., "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II", SPAW 7, 292-363

Henning 1940: Henning, W.B., "Sogdica", James G. Forlong Fund, vol. XXI, London (= W.B. Henning, Selected Papers II, Acta Iranica 15, Leiden, Téhéran & Liège, 1-69)

Henning 1940-42: Henning, W., "Mani's Last Journey", BSOAS 10.4, 941-953 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 81-94)

Henning 1942a: Henning, W., "An Astronomical Chapter of the Bundahishn", JRAS, 229-248 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 95-114)

Henning 1942b: Henning, W.B., "The Desintegration of the Avestic Studies", TPS, 40-55 = Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 151-168

Henning 1944: Henning, W.B., "The Murder of the Magi", JRAS 1944, 133-144 (Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 139-150)

Henning 1945: Henning, W.B., "Two Cenral Asian Words", TPS 1945, 150-162 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 259-272)

Henning 1946: Henning, W.B., "The Sogdian Texts of Paris", BSOAS 11.4, 713-740 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 231-258)

Henning 1948: Henning, W.B., "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony", BSOAS 12.2, 306-318 (Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 301-314)

Henning 1949: Henning, W.B., "The Aramaic Inscription of Aśoka found in Lampāka", BSOAS 13.1, 80-88 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 331-340)

Henning 1950: Henning, W.B., "A Pahlavi Poem", BSOAS 13.3, 641-8 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 349-356)

Henning 1951: Henning, W.B., Zoroaster: Politician or Witch Doctor?, Rutanbai Kutrak Lectures 1949, Oxford

Henning 1952: Henning, W.B., "A Farewell to the Khagan of the Aq-Aqatārān", BSOAS 14.3, 501-522 (= Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 387-408)

Henning 1954: Henning, W. B., "Ein unbeachtetes Wort im Awesta", Asiatica. Friedrich Weller Festschrift, Leipzig, 289-92

Henning 1957: Henning, W.B., The Inscription of Naqš-Rustam (1-48), Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, pt.3, vol.2, portfolio 2 (pls xxv-xlviii), London

Henning 1958: Henning, W.B., Mitteliranisch. Iranistik, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung, vierster Band, Brill, Leiden-Köln, 20-130

Henning 1964: Henning, W.B., "A Forgotten Avestan Word", Dr. Unvala Memorial Volume, 41-44

Henning 1965a: Henning, W.B., "Surkh-Kotal und Kaniška", ZDMG, 75-87 (=Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 631-644)

Henning 1965b: Henning, "A Sogdian God", BSOAS 28.2, 242-254 (=Acta Iranica 15, W.B. Henning Selected Papers II, 1977, 613-630)

Herzfeldt 1929-30: Herzfeldt, E., "Zarathustra", AMI I, Berlin, 77-185

Heteny 1973: Heteny, E., "Jerusalem in an Old Tibetan Map?", Tibetan Review, Jan.-Feb., 14

Hinnells 1994: Hinnells, J.R., "South Asian Diaspora Communities and Their Religion: A Comparative Study of Parsi Experiences", South Asia Research 14.1, 62-104

Hintze 1994: Hintze, A., Der Zamyād-Yašt. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Wiesbaden

Hintze 1994: Hintze, A., "The Greek and Hebrew Versions of the Book of Esther and its Iranian Background", Irano-Judaica III, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem, 34-39

Hinz 1961: Hinz, W., Zarathustra, Stuttgart

Hinz 1971: Hinz, W., "Mani and Kerdér", Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 marzo - 5 aprile 1970), Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLXVIII - 1971, Quaderno N.160, Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 485-499

Hoffmann 1979: Hoffmann, K., "Das Avesta in der Persis", Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of pre-Islamic Central Asia, ed. by J. Harmatta, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 89-94

Horn 1893: Horn, P., Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie. Sammlung indogermanischer Wörterbücher. IV, Strassburg

Hübschmann 1897: Hübschmann, H., Armenische Grammatik. Erster Teil. Armenische Etymologie, Leipzig (Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, New York, 1972: reprint)

Hultgård 1991: Hultgård, A., "Bahman Yašt: A Persian Apocalypse", Mysteries and Revelations. Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium, eds. J.J. Collins & J.H. Charlesworth, Sheffield, 114-34

Humbach 1959: Humbach, H., Die Gathas der Zarathustra I-II, Heidelberg

Humbach 1961a: Humbach, H., Die Kaniška-Inschrift von Surkh-Kotal. Ein Zeugnis des jüngeren Mithraismus aus Iran, Wiesbaden

Humbach 1961b: Humbach, H., Kušan und Hephthaliten. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, herausgegeben von Karl Hoffmann und Helmut Humbach, Beiheft C, München

Humbach 1972: Humbach, H., "Beobachtungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Awesta", MSS 31, 109-122

Humbach 1974: Humbach, H., "Bun-xānag et Ka'ba-ye Zardušt", Acta Iranica 3, Hommage universal III, Téhéran et Liège, 203-8

Humbach 1976: Humbach, H., "Gottes Boten im Awesta", MSS 34, 55-58

Humbach 1978: Humbach, H., "Miōra in India and the Hindiozed Magi", Études Mithraïques (Acta Iranica 17), Téhéran-Liège, 229-252

Humbach 1984: Humbach, H., A Western Approach to Zarathushtra, Bombay

Humbach 1989: Humbach, H., "Erbedestān, an Avesta-Pahlavi Text", K.R. Cama Oriental Institute. International Congress Proceedings (5th to 8th January, 1989), Bombay, 215-217

Humbach 1990: Humbach, H., Erbedistān: An Avesta-Pahlavi Text. Edited and Translated by H. Humbach in cooperation with J. Eifenbein, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 75, Neue Folge, Munich

Humbach 1991: Humbach, H., The Gāthās of Zarathustra and Other Old Avestan Texts, in collaboration with J. Eifenbein and P.O. Skjærvø, vol. I-II, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Reihe 1, Heidelberg

Humbach & Jamaspasa 1969: Humbach, H., and Jamaspasa, K.M., Vaēθā Nask. An Apocryphal Text on Zoroastrian Problems, translated and annotated, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden

Humbach & Wáng Shíping 1988: Humbach, H., & Wáng Shíping, "Die pahlavi-chinesische Bilingue von Xi'an", Acta Iranica 28 (Hommages et Opera Minora XII, A Green Leaf, پروك سيني, Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen), Leiden, 73-82

Humbach & Ichaporia 1994: Humbach, H., and Ichaporia, P., The Heritage of Zarathustra. A New translation of his Gāthās, Heidelberg

Hutter 1989: Hutter, M., Das Erlösungsgeschehn im manichäisch-iranischen Mythos. Motiv- und traditionsgeschichtliche Analysen (in: K.M. Woschitz, M. Hutter, K. Prenner, Das manichäische Urdrama des Lichtes. Studien zu koptischen, mitteliranischen und arabischen Texten. Teil 2), Wien

Insler 1975: Insler, S., The Gāthās of Zarathustra, Acta Iranica 8, troisième série, Textes et mémoires, sous le Haut Patronage de S.M.I. le Shahinshah Aryemehr, Téhéran-Liège

Jackson 1892: Jackson, W., An Avesta Grammar, Stuttgart

Jackson 1928: Jackson, A.V.N., Zoroastrian Studies. The Iranian Religion and Various Monographs, Indo-Iranian Series 12, New York

Jackson 1930: Jackson, A.V.N., "A Sketch of the Manichaean Doctrine Concerning the Future Life", BSOS 50.3, 177-98

Jackson 1932: Jackson, A.V.N., Researches in Manichaeism, New York

Jamasp 1907: Jamasp, H., Vendidad, Avesta Text with Pahlavi Translation and Commentary, and Glossarial Index 2 vols., Bombay

Jamasp-Asa 1970: Jamasp-Asa, K.M., "The Pahlavi Text of Viciřihā i dēn i vēh i Mazdayasnān", Henning Memorial Volume, ed. by M. Boyce & I. Gershevitch, London,

JamaspAsa & Humbach 1971: JamaspAsa, K.M., and Humbach, H., Pursišnihā. A Zoroastrian Catechism, Avesta Text with Pahlavi Translation, I-II, Wiesbaden

Jamasp-Asa 1981: Jamasp-Asa, K.M., "The Ritual of Hair Trimming and Nail Paring in Zoroastrianism", Acta Iranica 21, *Memorial George Morgenstierne*, 316-332

JamaspAsa 1982: JamaspAsa, K.M., Arqamadaēcā. A Zoroastrian Liturgy, Wien

JamaspAsa 1985: JamaspAsa, K.M., "On the drōn in Zoroastrianism", Acta Iranica 25 (*déxième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 335-56

JamaspAsa 1989: JamaspAsa, K.M., "Middle-Persian pespay 'Leading Position'", K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, International Congress Proceedings (5th to 8th January, 1989), Bombay, 218-219

Jamasp-Asana 1987: Pahlavi Texts, edited by Jamaspji Dastur Minocheherji Jamasp-Asana, I, Bombay [cf. PT]

JamaspAsana 1913: JamaspAsana, J.M., The Pahlavi Texts. Contained in the Codex MK copied in 1322 A.C. by the Scribe Mehr-AwKaī-kūsrū II, Bombay

Jelizarenkova & Toporov 1965: Елизаренкова, Т.Я. & Топоров, В.Н., Язык пали, Языки народов Азии и Африки, "Наука", Moscow

Jonas 1963: Jonas, H., The Gnostic Religion, Boston

de Jong 1996: de Jong, A., Traditions of the Magi. Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature, an Utrecht PhD thesis, Utrecht

de Jong 1995 [1997]: de Jong, A., "Shadow and Resurrection", BAI NS 9, 1995, 215-224

Josephson 1997: Josephson, J., The Translation Technique as Illustrated by Hōm Yašt, *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Iranica Uppsaliensia* 2, Uppsala

Jung 1926: Jung, L., Fallen Angels in Jewish, Christian and Muhammedan Literature, Philadelphia

Junker 1912a: Junker, H.F.J., "Ein mittelpersisches Schulgespräch. Pāzandtext mit Übersetzung und Erklärungen", Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.Hist..Kl., Heidelberg, 3-26

Junker 1912b: Junker, H.F.J., Franag ī Pahlavik, Heidelberg

Justi 1868: Justi, F., Der Bundahesh, Leipzig

Justi 1895: Justi, F., Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg

Inostranzev 1918: Иностранцев, М., Сасанидские этюды, Петроград

Isaev 1981: Isaev, M.I., "Еще раз о термине АФСИН[А]", Иранское Языкознание. Ежегодник 1980, Moscow, 186-189

Isebaert 1984: Isebaert, L., "L'étymologie moyen-iranienne d'après les sources latérales", Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982, ed. by W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongeloo, *Orientalia Lovaniensia* 16, Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Orientalistik, Leuven, 217-226

Ivanov 1925: Иванов, J., Богомипски Книги и Легенди, Българска Академия на Науките, София

Kammenhuber 1958: Kammenhuber, A., "Totenvorschriften und "Hund-Magie" im Vidēvdāt", ZDMG 108.2, 305-307

Kanga 1941: Kanga, E.M.F., Pahlavi Version of Yašt, Bombay

Kanga 1964: Kanga, E.M.F., Pahlavi Version of Yašt. Translated for the First Time into English with Copious Notes and an Introduction, Bombay

Kanga 1969: Kanga, M.F., "Dātistān ī Dēnik - Pursišn XVI. A Critical Study", K.R. Cama Oriental Institute Golden Jubilee Volume, Bombay, 65-84

Kapadia 1953: Kapadia, D.D., Glossary of Pahlavi Vendidad, Bombay

Kaplan 1995: Kaplan, A., The Bahir. A Translation and Commentary, Northvale, New Jersey / London

Kasumova 1978: Касумова, С.Ю., "К толкованию сочетания в среднеперсидском сочинении "Sahrestānīhā ī Erān", Доклады Академии Наук АзССР 8.34, 79-81

Kasumova 1994: Касумова, С.Ю., Среднеперсидская эпиграфика Кавказской Албании (Дербент). Города Ирана. Элм. Баку

Khanlari 1347h.š.: Xānlārī, P., Ta'rif-i Zabān-i Parsi, I, Tehran

Kellens 1975: Kellens, J., "Mythes et conceptions avestiques sous les Sassanides", Acta Iranica 4 (*Monumentum H.S. Nyberg*), 457-470

Kellens 1984: Kellens, J., "Yima, magicien entre les dieux et les hommes", Acta Iranica 23, *Hommages et Opera Minora IX, Orientalia j. Duchesne-Guillemin Emerito Oblata*, Leiden, 267-281

Kellens 1989a: Kellens, J., "Avesta", EI 3, 35-44

Kellens 1989b: Kellens, J., "Avestique", Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum, herausgegeben von Rüdiger Schmitt, Wiesbaden, 32-55

Kellens & Pirart 1988: Kellens, J., & Pirart, E., Les textes vieil-avestiques I, Wiesbaden

Kellens & Pirart 1990: Kellens, J., & Pirart, E., Les textes vieil-avestiques II, Wiesbaden

Kellens & Pirart 1991: Kellens, J., & Pirart, E., Les textes vieil-avestiques III, Wiesbaden

Kellens 1994a, J., "La fonction aurorale de Miθra et la Daēnā", Studies in Mithraism, ed. by J.R. Hinnells, Roma, 165-171

- Kellens 1994b: Kellens, J., "L'eschatologie mazdeenne ancienne", Irano-Judaica III, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem, 49-53
- Kellens 1995: Kellens, J., "L'âme entre le cadavre et le paradis", JA 283.1, 19-56
- Kent 1954: Kent, R.G., Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon, Second Edition, New Haven
- Kirste 1888, J., "Gemmen mit Pehlilegenden", WZKM 2, 114-123
- Klíma 1956: Klíma, O., "Mazdak und die Juden", Archiv Orientální 24, 420-431
- Klíma 1957: Klíma, O., Mazdak. Geschichte einer sozialen Bewegung im sassanidischen Persien, Praha
- Klíma 1958a: Klíma, O., "Kamsarakan und Κομοσπονη", Archiv Orientální 26, 339-342
- Klíma 1958b: Klíma, O., "Baat the Manichee", Archiv Orientální 26, 342-346
- Klíma 1958c: Klíma, O., "Iranische Miszellen", Archiv Orientální 26, 603-616
- Klíma 1959a: Klíma, O., "Šāhpuhr I Mitrbōzantkān", Archiv Orientální 27, 54-59
- Klíma 1959b: Klíma, O., "Abrātān, DkS VII., 3,21.24", Archiv Orientální 27, 206-7
- Klíma 1959c: Klíma, O., "Iranica", Archiv Orientální 27, 413-414
- Klíma 1962: Klíma, O., Manis Zeit und Leben, Prag
- Klíma 1964: Klíma, O., "Two Comments to the Middle Iranian Lexicon", Dr. Unvala Memorial Volume, Bombay, 35-40
- Klíma 1977: Klíma, O., Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mazdakismus, Praha
- Kotwal 1966: Kotwal, F.M.P., Vaetha Nask, Bombay
- Kotwal 1985: Kotwal, F.M., "An Ancient Irani Ritual for Tending the Fire", Acta Iranica 25 (*dèxième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 365-370
- Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992: Kotwal, F.M., and Kreyenbroek, Ph.G., with contributions by J. R. Russell, The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume I. Hērbedestān, Studia Iranica Cahier 10, Paris
- Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995: Kotwal, F.M., and Kreyenbroek, Ph.G., with contributions by J. R. Russell, The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume II. Nērangestān, Fragard 1, Studia Iranica Cahiers 16, Paris
- Kovacs 1989: Kovacs, M.G., The Epic of Gilgamesh, translated with an introduction, Stanford University Press
- Kraeling 1953: Kraeling, C.H., "The Excavations at Dura-Europos", Final Report VIII.1, 283-317

- Kreyenbroek 1985: Kreyenbroek, P.G., Sraoša in the Zoroastrian Tradition, Orientalia Rheno-Thriectina, edidit J.Gonda, *volmen vicesimum octavum*, Brill, Leiden
- Kreyenbroek 1987a: Kreyenbroek, P.G., "The Zoroastrian Priesthood After the Fall of the Sasanian Empire", Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22-24 mai 1985), Str. Cahier 5, Paris, 151-166
- Kreyenbroek 1987b: Kreyenbroek, P.G., "The Shaping of Zoroastrian Theology: Ašī, Vərəθraγna and the Promotion of the Aməša Spəntas", Histoire et Cultes, ed. by Bernard & Grenet, 1337-145
- Kreyenbroek 1991: Kreyenbroek, Ph.G., Review on Erbedistān: An Avesta-Pahlavi Text. Edited and Translated by H. Humbach in cooperation with J. Elfenbein, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 15, Neue Folge, Munich 1990, 402-4
- Kreyenbroek 1992: Kreyenbroek, P.G., "Mithra and Ahreman, Binyāmīn and Malak Tāwūs. Traces of an Ancient Myth in the Cosmogonies of Two Modern Sects", Recurrent Patterns in Iranian Religions. From Mazdaism to Sufism. Proceedings of the Round Table Held in Bamberg (30th September -4th October 1991), ed. Ph. Gignoux, Cahiers de Str 11, 57-79
- Kreyenbroek 1993: Kreyenbroek, P.G., "Cosmogony and Cosmology in Zoroastrianism/Mazdaism", EIr 6, 303-307
- Kreyenbroek 1995: Kreyenbroek, P.G., "Mithra and Ahreman in Iranian Cosmogonies", Studies in Mithraism, ed. Hinnealls, Roma, 173-182
- Kuiper 1964-65: Kuiper, F.B.J., "The Bliss of Aša", Indo-Iranian Journal 7, 96-129
- Kutscher, Naveh, Shaked 1970: Kutscher, Y., Naveh, J., Shaked, Sh., "Hakkātōqōtī hā'arāmīyyōtī šel Ašoka", Léšōnēnā 17h (34), 125-134
- Kuznetsov 1976a: Kuznetsov, B.I., "A Letter from Leningrad", Tibetan Review, Dec., 20
- Kuznetsov 1976b: Кузнецов, Б.И., "'Слово о Двенадцати Снах Шахнинши" и его связи с памятниками Литературы Востока", ТОДРЛ 30, Ленинград, 272-278
- Kuznetsov 1986: Кузнецов, Б.И., Словарь древнерусской литературы, "Наука", Москва, 408-410
- de Lagarde, P., Persische Studien, Göttingen 1884
- Leslau 1951: Leslau, W., Falasha Anthology, Yale Judaica Series Vol. VI, New Haven and London
- Leslau 1987: Leslau, W., Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic), Ge'ez-English, English-Ge'ez, with an index of the Semitic roots, Wiesbaden
- Le Strange & Nicholson 1921: Le Strange, G., and Nicholson, R.A., The Fārsnāma by Ibn al-Balkhī, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series NS 1, London
- Levine 1962: Levine, B.A., Survivals of Ancient Canaanite in the Mishnah, Brandeis University PhD thesis [unpublished]

Levine 1988: Levine, E., The Aramaic Version of the Bible. Contents and Contexts., Berlin & New York

Lidzbarski 1925: Lidzbarski, M., Ginza Rabbā. Der Schatz oder das große Buch der Mandaer, Göttingen

Lidzbarski 1927: Lidzbarski, M., "Warum schrieb Mani Aramäisch?", Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, (reprinted in Der Manichäismus, ed. Geo Widengren, Wege der Forschung, Band CLXVIII, Darmstadt, 1977, 249-254)

Lieu 1994: Lieu, S.N.G., Manichaeanism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, ed. R. van den Broek, H.-J.W. Drijvers, H.S. Versnel, vol. 118, Leiden

Lewy 1944: Lewy, H., "The Genesis of the Faulty Persian Chronology", JAOS lxiv, 197-214

Lin Wushu 1991: Lin Wushu, "The Origin of 'The Compendium of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light' in Chinese", Manichaica Selecta. Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his seventieth Birthday, ed. by A. van Tongerloo and Søren Giversen, Lovanii, 225-232

Littmann 1916: Littmann, E., "Hārūt und Mārūt", Festschrift F.G. Andreas, Leipzig, 70-87

Livshits 1975: Лившиц, В.А. "Зороастрийский" календарь", Ил. Бикерман, Э., Хронология древнего мира, "Наука", Moscow [Russian translation of: Bickerman 1969: Bickerman, E.J., Chronology of the Ancient World, London], 320-332

Livshits 1979: Лившиц, В.А., "Авестийское ирвдхс.ихти-", Переднеазиатский Сборник ИИИ. История и Филология Стран Древнего Востока, "Наука", Moscow, 160-7

Macintosh 1961: Macintosh, A.A., "A Consideration of Hebrew חַי", Vetus Testamentum 11, 471-9

MacKenzie 1964: MacKenzie, D.N., "Zoroastrian Astrology in the Bundahishn", BSOAS 27, 511-529

MacKenzie 1967a: MacKenzie, D.N., "The Vanguard Lying Down", Sir J.J. Zarthohti Madressa Centenary Volume, Bombay, 130-6

MacKenzie 1967b: MacKenzie, D.N., "Notes on the Transcription of Pahlavi", BSOAS 30.1, 17-29

MacKenzie 1970: MacKenzie, D.N., "A Zoroastrian Master of Ceremonies", Henning Memorial Volume, ed. by M. Boyce & I. Gershevitch, London, 264-271

MacKenzie 1971: MacKenzie, D.N., A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary, London Oxford New York Toronto

MacKenzie 1979: MacKenzie, D.N., "Mani's Šābuhragān-I", BSOAS 42, 500-534

MacKenzie 1980: MacKenzie, D.N., "Mani's Šābuhragān-II", BSOAS 43, 288-310

MacKenzie 1989a: MacKenzie, D.N., Kerdīr's Inscription. The Sasanian Rock Reliefs at Naqsh-e Rostam. Naqsh-e Rostam 6. The Triumph of Shapur I (together with an account of the representations of Kerdīr), ed. G. Herrmann, Iranische Denkmäler L.13 r. II, Iranische Felsreliefs I, Berlin

MacKenzie 1989b: MacKenzie, D.N., "Bundahishn", Elr 3, 547-551

MacKenzie 1992: MacKenzie, D.N., "Cīhrdād Nask", Elr 5, 560-561

MacKenzie 1993a: MacKenzie, D.N., Review on Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992: Kotwal, F.M., and Kreyenbroek, Ph.G., with contributions by J.R. Russell, The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume I. Hērbedestān, Studia Iranica Cahiers 10, JRAS, 451-4

MacKenzie 1993b: MacKenzie, D.N., "Dāmdād Nask", Elr 6, 631-2

MacKenzie 1996: MacKenzie, D.N., "Dūrāsraw", Elr 7, 596

Macuch 1987: Macuch, M., "Die Erwähnung der Ordalzeremonie des Ādurbād ī Maraspadān im Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag", AMI 20, 319-322

Macuch 1995: Macuch, M., Review on Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1992: Kotwal, F.M., and Kreyenbroek, Ph.G., with contributions by J. R. Russell, The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Volume I. Hērbedestān, Studia Iranica Cahiers 10, BSOAS, 372-5

Madan 1911: Madan, D.M., The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Denkard, Published by "The Society for the Promotion of Researches into the Zoroastrian Religion" under the supervision of D.M. Madan, I-II, Bombay

Markwart 1898: Marquart, J., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran I, Göttingen

Markwart 1901: Marquart, J., Erānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i. Mit historisch-kritischem Kommentar und historischen und topographischen Excursen. Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Ph-hist. Klasse, Neue Folge. Bd.III aus den Jahren 1899-1901, Berlin (1901), revised by de Goeje WZKM 16 (1902), 189-97

Markwart 1905: Marquart, J., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran II, Leipzig

Markwart 1930: Markwart, J., "Das Naurooz, seine Geschichte und seine Bedeutung", Dr. Modi Memorial Volume, Bombay

Markwart & Messina 1931: Markwart J., A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Erānšahr (Pahlavi Text, version and Commentary), ed. by G.Messina S.I., Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma

Markwart 1938: Markwart, J., Wehrdāt und Arang. Untersuchungen zur mythischen und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Ostiran, hrsg. v. H.H. Schaeder, Leiden

Martin 1994: Martin, D., "Tibet at the Center: A Historical Study of some Tibetan Geographical Conceptions Based on Two Types of Country-Lists Found in Bon Histories", Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, FAGERNES 1992, vol. I, Oslo, 517-532

Massé 1926-1951: Massé, H., et al., Le Livre de Gerchāsp. Poème persan d'Asadi de Toûs, vol. I 1926, vol. II 1951, Paris

Nyberg 1928: Nyberg, H.S., "Ein Hymnus auf Zervān im Bundahis'n", ZDMG, 8, 217-235

Nyberg 1929: Nyberg, H.S., "Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdénnes II", JA 214, 193-310

Nyberg 1931a: Nyberg, H.S., "Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdénnes II", JA 219, 1-134

Nyberg 1931b: Nyberg, H.S., "Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdénnes III", JA 220, 193-244

Nyberg 1933: Nyberg, H.S., "La légende de Keresāspa. Transcription des textes pehlevi, avec un traduction nouvelle et de notes philologiques", *Oriental Studies in Honour of Coursetil Erachil Palty*, Bombay/London, 336-52 = *Acta Iranica 7* (1975), 379-397

Nyberg 1934: Nyberg, H.S., "Texte zum Mazdayasnischen Kalender", *Indjudning till filosofi-doktorspromotionen vid Uppsala Universitet, Torsdagen den 31 Maj 1934* = *Acta Iranica 7* (1975), 397-480

Nyberg 1938: Nyberg, H.S., *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, Deutscher Verlag, München, 1966 [Neudruck der Ausgabe 1938]

Nyberg 1964: Nyberg, H.S., "The Opening Section of Denkart Book V", *Dr. Unvala Memorial Volume*, Bombay, 99-112

Nyberg 1962: Nyberg, H.S., *A Manual of Pahlavi I*, Texts, etc., Wiesbaden

Nyberg 1974: Nyberg, H.S., *A Manual of Pahlavi II*, Glossary, Wiesbaden

O'tendburg 1892: О'тенбургъ, С., "Къ вопросу объ источникахъ Слова о Ахематати сакъ-Махашинъ", *Журналъ министерства народного просвещения, ноябрь 1892*, Санкт-Петербург, 135-140

Olsson 1991: Olsson, T., "The Refutation of the Manichaean Doctrines in Denkard 3. 200", *Manichaea Selecta*, ed. by A. van Tongerloo & S. Giversen, Leiden Brill, 274-284

Ort 1967: Ort, L. J. R., *Mane A. Religio-historical Description of his Personality*, Leiden

Pagliari & Bausani 1960: Pagliari A., e Bausani A., *Storia della letteratura persiana*, Milano

Panaino 1990-95: Panaino, A., *Istoria I-II, Serie Orientale Roma Vol. LXVIII, I (1990) & LXVIII, 2 (1995)*, Roma

Paper 1964-5: Paper, H., "The Vatican Judeo-Persian Pentateuch (Genesis)", *Acta Orientalia* 28, 263-340

Paper 1972: Paper, H.H., *A Judeo-Persian Pentateuch. The Text of the Oldest Judeo-Persian Pentateuch Translation*, British Museum Ms. Or. 5446, *Publications of the Palestine Oriental Museum*, Jerusalem

Paper 1976: Paper, H., "Judeo-Persian Deverbatives in 'and s't", *ILJ* 10, 56-71

Perkhanian 1968: Perkhanian, A.G., "Notes sur le lexique iranien et arménien", *REArm* 5, 9-30

Reeves 1992: Reeves J.C., *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*, West Orange

Reeves 1993: Reeves J.C., "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112.1, 110-115

Reichelt 1901: Reichelt, H., "Aramäische Inschriften aus Kapadocien", *WZKM* 15, 51-56

Rosenberg 1904: Rosenberg, F., *Le livre de Zoroastre (Zaratusht Nama) de Zartusht-Bahām ben Paīd*, St. Petersburg

Rosenthal 1939: Rosenthal, F., *Die aramäische Forschung seit Th. Noldeke's Veröffentlichungen*, Leiden

Rudenko 1965: Руденко, Леонид Иванович, *Легенда и Мифология. Период, предисловие и примечания*, М. Л. "Наука", Москва

Russell 1985: Russell, J.R., "Armeno-Iranica", *Acta Iranica* 25 (*déxième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 447-458

Russell 1985-6: Russell, J.R., "The Name of Zoroaster in Armenian", *Journal of Society for Armenian Studies* 2, 3-10

Russell 1987a: Russell, J.R., *Zoroastrianism in Armenia*, *Harvard Iranian Series Volume Five*, Cambridge

Russell 1987b: Russell, J.R., "Mahmi Reconsidered", *Journal of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute* 54, 74-80

Russell 1990: Russell, J.R., "Kartir and Mane: A Shamanistic Model of their Conflict", *Acta Iranica* 30 (*Zoroastrian Festchrift*), 180-193

Russell 1990-91: Russell, J.R., "Two Notes on Biblical Tradition and Native Epic in the 'Book of Lamentation' of St. Gregory Narekats'i", *REArm* 22, 135-145

Russell 1991: Russell, J.R., "The Dō-a-ye Nam Stāyishn", *Corolla Iranica. Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil Mackenzie on the occasion of his 65th birthday on April 8th, 1991*, ed. by R.E. Emmerick and D. Weber, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris (Offprint)

Russell 1993: Russell, J.R., "On Mysticism and Esotericism among the Zoroastrians", *Iranian Studies* 26.1-2, 74-93

Sabato 1995: Sabato, Mordakay, "arāštim nōšāstīm tammillīōn hattallmōdūt: 'prg'", *Tarbiš* 65.3, 509-513

Sachau 1879: Sachau, C.E., *The Chronology of the Ancient Nations*, London

Sachau 1910: Sachau, C.E., *Alberuni's India. An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Customs, Laws, and Astrology of India about A.D. 1030*, London

Sachau 1923: Sachau, C.E., *Alberuni. Chronologie orientalischer Völker*, ed. C.E. Sachau, Leipzig

Salemann 1908: Salemann, C., "Manichäische Studien", Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des Sciences de St-Petersbourg, VIII série, classe hist.-phil., 8, 10

Mahlagha Samadi 1986: Mahlagha Samadi, Das Chwaresmische Verbum, Wiesbaden

Sanjana 1894: Sanjana, D.P., Nirangistan: a Photozincographed Facsimile of a MS. belonging to Shams-ul Ulama Dastur Dr. Hoshangjee Jamaspjee of Poona, Bombay

Sanjana 1874-1928: Sanjana, P.B., and D.P., The Dinkard. The Original Pahlavi Text: the same transliterated in Zend Characters: Translations of the Text in the Gujarati and English Languages: A Commentary and a glossary of Select Terms, vol. 1-19, Bombay

Scarcia 1965: Scarcia, G., "Sulla religione di Zābul. Appunti per servire all' studio del ciclo epico sistano", AION 15, 119-65

Scarcia 1983: Scarcia, G., "Herakles-Verethragna and the Mi'rā j of Rustam", AOASh 37.1-3, 85-109

Schaefer 1927: Schaefer, H. H., Urform und Fortbildungen des Manichäischen Systems, Leipzig

Schaefer 1930: Schaefer, H., Iranische Beiträge, Halle

Schaefer 1934: Schaefer, H., "Iranica", Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 3/4, 1-88

Schaefer 1941: Schaefer, H.H., "Der iranische Zeitgott und sein Mythos", ZDMG 95.2, 294-5

Schlerath 1987: Schlerath, B., "The Andreas Theory", EIr 11, 29-30

Schmeja 1982: Schmeja, H., "Ging ein zum Throne der Götter", Acta Iranica 22, 185-188

Schmitt 1993: Schmitt, R., "Cuneiform Script", EIr 6, 456-462

Schneemelcher 1985: Schneemelcher, W., New Testament Apocrypha, English translation, edited by R. McL. Wilson, I, Philadelphia (cf. also Hennecke)

Scholem 1965: Scholem, G., Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmidic Tradition, New York (2nd edition)

Schippmann 1971: Schippmann, K., Die iranischen Feuerheiligtümer, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten XXX, Berlin

Schwartz 1975a: Schwartz, M., "Cautes and Cautopates, The Mithraic Torchbearers", Mithraic Studies, ed. J.R.Hinnels, 405-423

Schwartz 1975b: Schwartz, M., "Proto-Indo-European √ ġem", Acta Iranica 5, 195-211

Schwartz 1982: Schwartz, M., "Blood" in Sogdian and Old Iranian", Acta Iranica 22, 189-196

Schwartz 1985a: Schwartz, M., "Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster: on the Paronomasia of Yasna 48.10 and on Indo-European H₂EG 'To Make Taboo' and the Reciprocity Verbs KwSEN(W) and MEGH", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce), Leiden, 473-496

Schwartz 1986: Schwartz, M., "Coded Sound Patterns, Acrostics, and Anagrams in Zoroaster's Oral Poetry", Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach, ed. R. Schmitt and P.O. Skjaervø, Kitzinger, München, 327-392

Schwartz 1989a: Schwartz, M., "Sound, Sense and 'Seeing' in Zoroaster: The outer reaches of orality", K.R. Cama Oriental Institute, International Congress Proceedings (5th to 8th January, 1989, Bombay, 127-163

Schwartz 1989b: Schwartz, M., "Pers. SAUGAND XURDAN, etc. 'To Take An Oath; (Not 'To Drink Sulphur')", Cahiers du Studia Iranica 7, 293-295

Schwartz 1998: Schwartz, M., Irano-Judaica IV, Jerusalem (forthcoming)

Schwartz 1896-1912: Schwarz, P., Iran im Mittelalter nach den arabischen Geographien, I-III [reprint: 1969, Hildesheim, New York]

Shahbazi 1986: Shahbazi, A.Sh., "Iranian Notes 7-13", AMI NF 19, 163-170

Shahbazi 1994: Shahbazi, Sh. A., "Persepolis and the Avesta", AMI 27, 85-90

Shaked 1969a: Shaked, Sh., "Esoteric Trends in Zoroastrianism", Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities III, Jerusalem, 175-221

Shaked 1969b: Shaked, Sh., "Specimens of Middle Persian verse", Henning Memorial Volume, ed. by M. Boyce & I. Gershevitch, London, 395-405

Shaked 1971: Shaked, Sh., "The Notions mēnog and gētīg in the Pahlavi Texts and their Relation to Eschatology", Acta Orientalia 33, 59-107

Shaked 1974a: Shaked, Sh., "Ambiguous Words in Pahlavi", IOS 4, 227-257

Shaked 1974b: Shaked, Sh., "Some Terms Relating to Man in Pahlavi, I. axw (ox)", Mémorial Jean de Menasce, ed. Ph. Gignoux / A. Tafazzoli, (Fondation Culturelle Iranienne 185) Louvain, 319-326

Shaked 1975: Shaked, Sh., "Some Legal and Administrative Terms of the Sasanian Period", Acta Iranica 5, deuxième série (Monumentum H.S. Nyberg), Teheran-Liège-Leiden, 213-225

Shaked 1979: Shaked, Sh., The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages. An Edition, with Translation and Notes, of Dēnkard book Six, by Aturpāt-i Emētān, Persian Heritage Series ed. by E. Yarshater, Number 34, Boulder, Col.

Shaked 1980: Shaked, Sh., "Mihr the Judge", JSAI 2, 1-31

Shaked 1982a: Shaked, Sh., "Two Judaeo-Iranian Contributions: 1. Iranian Functions in the Book of Esther; 2. Fragments of Two Karaite Commentaries on Daniel in Judeo-Persian", Irano-Judaica I, ed. by Sh. Shaked, Jerusalem, 292-322

Shaked 1982b: Shaked, Sh., "Pahlavi Notes", Acta Iranica 22, 2^e. série, 7 (Monumentum G. Morgenstierne II), 197-205

Shaked 1984: Shaked, Sh., "From Iran to Islam: Notes on some Themes in Transmission", JSAI 4, 31-67

Shaked 1985: Shaked, Sh., "Bagdāna, King of Demons, and Other Iranian Terms in Babylonian Aramaic Magic", *Acta Iranica* 24 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora X. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 511-542

Shaked 1987: Shaked, Sh., "Paymān: An Iranian Idea in Contact with Greek Thought and Islam", *Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22-24 mai 1985)*, *Stir. Cahier* 5, Paris, 217-240

Shaked 1988, review on: Skalmowski & van Tongerloo 1984, *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*, ed. by W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, *Orientalia Lovaniensia* 16, Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Orientalistiek, Leuven; *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 45.1/2, 156-162

Shaked 1989: Shaked, Sh., "First Man, First King. Notes on Semitic-Iranian Syncretism and Iranian Mythological Transformation", *Gilgāmiš / גִּלְגָּמֶשׁ. Studies in Honour of Z. Werblowsky. Suppl. to NUMEN* 50, 239-256

Shaked 1990a: Shaked, Sh., "Zoroastrian Polemics against Jews in the Sassanian and Early Islamic Period", *Irano-Judaica* II, ed. by Sh. Shaked and A. Netzer, Jerusalem, 85-104

Shaked, 1990b: Shaked, Sh., "Bible Translations", *ELr* 4, 206-204

Shaked 1990c, Sh., "'For the sake of the soul': a Zoroastrian Idea in Transmission into Islam", *JSAI* 13, 15-32

Shaked 1992-93: Shaked, Sh., "La diversité religieuse dans le zoroastrisme sasanide", *Annuaire EPHE, V^e Section*, t.101, 145-7

Shaked 1993a: Shaked, Sh., "The Myth of Zurvan. Cosmogony and Eschatology", *Messiah and Christos. Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Itamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa, Tübingen, 219-240

Shaked 1993b: Shaked, Sh., "A Dictionary of Aramaic Ideograms in Pahlavi", *JAOS* 113.1, 75-81 (a review article of: Uta 1988, Bo (ed.), *Frahang-i Pahlavik*, from the posthumous papers of Henrik Samuel Nyberg, with the collaboration of Christopher Toll, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden)

Shaked 1994a: Shaked, Sh., "Islamic Reports concerning Zoroastrianism", *JSAI* 17, 43-84

Shaked 1994b: Shaked, Sh., *Qualism in Transformation. Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran. Jordan Lectures 1991, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London*

Shaked 1996a: Shaked, Sh., "Ḥazōnōt yehūdīyyīm wətrānīyyīm bīqūḇal hattalmūd", *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. I.M.Garfie, et al., Jerusalem, 467-486

Shaked 1996b: Shaked, Sh., "Jewish Sasanian Sigillography", *Res Orientalia VII: Moyen Orient. Carrefour des grandes religions. Volume in Honour of Philippe Gignoux*, Paris, 239-256

Shaki 1970: Shaki, M., "Some Basic Tenets of the Eclectic Metaphysics of the Dēnkart", *Archiv Orientalní* 38, 289-93

Shaki 1974: Shaki, M., "Two Middle Persian Legal Terms for Private Property", *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, ed. Ph.Gignoux / A.Tafazzoli (*Fondation Culturelle Iranienne* 185), Louvain, 327-336

Shaki 1977: Shaki, M., "The Obstruction of Justice", *Archiv Orientalní* 45, 48-53

Shaki 1978: Shaki, M., "The Social Doctrine of Mazdak in the light of the Middle Persian Evidence", *Archiv Orientalní* 46, 289-306

Shaki 1981: Shaki, M., "The Dēnkard Account of the History of the Zoroastrian Scriptures", *Archiv Orientalní* 49, 114-25

Shaki 1985: Shaki, M., "The Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings of Mazdak", *Acta Iranica* 25 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 527-544

Shaki 1988: Shaki, M., "Pahlavica", *Acta Iranica* 28 (*Hommages et Opera Minora, Volume XII, A Green Leaf*, برگ سبز, *Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*), Leiden, 93-99

Shaki 1993a: Shaki, M., "Dād Nask", *ELr* 6, 546-549

Shaki 1993b: Shaki, M., "Dādestān ī Dēnīg", *ELr* 6, 550-554

Shapira 1997: Шапира, Д., "Совершенный Человек в иранских традициях", *Совершенный Человек*, издан Шариф Шукуров, Москва, 213-232

Shapira 1999a: Shapira, D., "Qisṣa-ye Dānī'ēl - or 'The Story of Dānī'ēl' - in Judaeo-Persian: The Text and its Translation", *Sepherot* 22 (1999), 337-366 [Hebrew]

קִישָׁה דִּנְאֵל - אוּ מִשְׁטֵה דִּנְאֵל - בְּמִסְתֵּי הַדִּנְאוֹת: הַדְרִיכָה הַחֲמִישִׁית, סִפּוּת כִּיב לְתַנְחִימִים 366-337 (1999)

Shapira 1999b: Shapira, D., "On the Name *Manichaïos*, on *Jywndg Gryw* and Some Other Manichaean Terms", *Irano-Judaica* IV, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem (forthcoming)

Simon 1998: Simon, R., "Mānt and Muḥammad", *JSAI* 21 (1997), 118-141

Sims-Williams 1976: Sims-Williams, N., "The Sogdian Fragments of the British Library", *IJJ* 3, 43-82

Sims-Williams 1981: Sims-Williams, N., "The Final Paragraph of the Tomb-inscription of Darius (DNb, 50-60): The Old Persian Text in the Light of an Aramaic Version", *BSOAS* 44, 1-7

Sims-Williams & Cribb 1995/96: Sims-Williams, N., and Cribb, J., "A New Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great", *Silk Road Art and Archeology* 4, *The Institute of Silk Road Studies, Kamakura*, 75-142

Skalmowski 1984, W., "Wheel within Wheel: Remarks on Bundahišn", *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*, ed. by W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 16), Uitgeverij Peeters, Leuven, 269-311

Skjærvø 1983a: Skjærvø, O.P., "Case in Inscriptional Middle Persian, Inscriptional Parthian and the Pahlavi Psalter", StIr 12, 47-62 & 151-181

Skjærvø 1983b: Skjærvø, O.P., "Kirdir's Vision": Translation and Analysis", AM NF 16, 269-306

Skjærvø 1985: Skjærvø, P.O., "Thematic and Linguistic Parallelism in the Achaemenian and Sassanian Inscriptions", Acta Iranica 25 (*dixième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 593-603

Skjærvø 1989a: Skjærvø, P.O., "Bag Nask", Elr 3, 400-1

Skjærvø 1989b: Skjærvø, O.P., "Bariš Nask", Elr 3, 799-800

Skjærvø 1989c: Skjærvø, O.P., "Bagān Yašt", Elr 3, 406

Skjærvø 1995b: Skjærvø, P.O., "Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of Giants, Irano-Manichaica III", AOAS XLVII (1-2), 187-223

Skjærvø 1996a: Skjærvø, P.O., "Iranian Elements in Manicheism. A Comparative Approach. Irano-Manichaica I", Res Orientalia VII: Moyen Orient: Carrefour des grandes religions. Volume in Honour of Philippe Gignoux, Paris, 263-284

Skjærvø 1996b: Skjærvø, P.O., "The Manichean Polemical Hymns in M 28 I. A Review Article", BAI NS 10, 239-255

Skjærvø 1999: Skjærvø, P.O., "Avestan Quotations in Old Persian?", Irano-Judaica IV, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem (forthcoming)

Staviskij 1974, B. Ja., Искусство Средней Азии Древний Период. VI в. до н.э. - VIII в. н.э., "Искусство", Moscow

Steinglass 1975: Steinglass, F., A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary..., Beirut (reprint; first published 1892)

Stern 1971, S.M., "Ya'qūb the Copersmith and Persian National Sentiment", Iran and Islam, Edinburgh, 535-555

Stronach 1977: Stronach, D., "Cyrus' Capital in Old Tibetan Map", Tibetan Review, Jan., 14-15

Stroumsa 1984: Stroumsa, G.A.G., Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology, Leiden

Stroumsa 1994: Stroumsa, G.G., "A Zoroastrian Origin of the *Safrūt*?", Irano-Judaica III, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem, 17-33

Sukenik 1947: Sūqēnīq, ʔ. l., Bēt-kāneset šel Dūrā-ʔEbrōpōs wəsiyyūrāw, Yərūšālayīm, TS"Z

Sundermann 1978: Sundermann, W., "Some More Remarks on Mithra in the Manichaean Pantheon", Acta Iranica, Textes et Mémoires IV, Téhéran-Liège, 485-489

Sundermann 1979a: Sundermann, W., "The Five Sons of the Manichaean God Mithra", Mysteria Mithrae, ed. U. Bianchi, Leiden, 777-787

Sundermann 1979b: Sundermann, W., "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos", Altorientalische Forschungen 6, 95-133

Sundermann 1986: Sundermann, W., "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer", Altorientalische Forschungen 13, 40-92, 239-317

Sundermann 1988: Sundermann, W., "Kē čīhr az yazdān. Zur Titulatur der Sasanidenkönige", Archiv Orientalni 56, 338-340

Sundermann 1989: Зундерман, В., "Еще один фрагмент из 'Книги Гигантов' Мани", VDI (4), 67-79 (Russian; a revised and authorized version of W. Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch", Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata, Leiden 1984 [Acta Iranica 23], 491-505)

Sundermann 1990: Sundermann, W., "Bahman Yašt", Elr 4, ed. by E. Yarshater, London New York, 492-3

Sundermann 1992: Sundermann, W., "Die Jungfrau der guten Taten", Cahiers de Studia Iranica 11, *Recurrent Patterns in Iranian Religions: From Mazdaism to Sufism. Proceedings of the Round Table Held in Bamberg (30th September - 4th October 1991)*, Societas Iranologica Europaea, Association pour l'avancement des études iraniennes, Paris, 159-173

Sundermann 1993a: Sundermann, W., "An Early Attestation of the Name of the Tajiks", Medioiranica. Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990, ed. by W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, Orientalia Lovaniensia 48, Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Orientalistiek, Leuven, 163-171

Sundermann 1993b: Sundermann, W., "Cosmogony and Cosmology in Zoroastrianism/in Manichaeism / in the Mazdaitic Religion", Elr 6, 310-317

Sundermann 1994: Sundermann, W., "Mani's 'Book of the Giants' and the Jewish Books of Enoch. A Case of Terminological Difference and What it Implies", Irano-Judaica III, ed. by Sh. Shaked & A. Netzer, Jerusalem, 40-7

Sundermann 1996: Sundermann, W., "Dīnāvarīya", Encyclopædia Iranica VII, Costa Mesa, California, 418-419

Swain 1940: Swain, J.W., "The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire", Classical Philology 35, 1-21

Szemerényi 1980: Szemerényi, O., "Semitic Influence on the Iranian Lexicon I", The Bible World, C.H. Gordon Festschrift, New York, 221-237

Ṭabarī, The History of al-Ṭabarī (Ta'rīkh al-rūsul wa'l-mulūk), vol. IV. The Ancient Kingdoms, translated and annotated by Moshe Perlmann, annotations of Iranian names and terms by Shaul Shaked, Bibliotheca Persica, ed. by Ehsan Yar-Shater, State University of New York Press, 1987

Tafazzoli 1348h.š. (1969): Tafazzoli, A., Vāžanāmave-Mīnū-ye-Xarad, Tehrān

Tafazzoli 1364h.š. (1985): Tafazzoli, A., Mīnū-ye Xarad, Tehrān, 2nd edition [1st edition: 1354š (1975)]

- Tafazzoli 1971: Tafazzoli, A., "Pahlavica", Acta Orientalia 33, 193-204
- Tafazzoli 1974a: Tafazzoli, A., "Pahlavica II", Acta Orientalia 36, 113-123
- Tafazzoli 1974b: Tafazzoli, A., "Some Middle-Persian Quotations in Classical Arabic and Persian Texts", Mémorial Jean de Menasce, ed. Ph. Gignoux et A. Tafazzoli, A., (Fondation Culturelle Iranienne 185) Louvain, 337-349
- Tafazzoli 1354h.š. (1975): Tafazzoli, A., "TašhTh- i dō bayt az Sāhnāmah", Sīmurgh, Abān, 2, 26-7
- Tafazzoli 1355h.š. (1977): Tafazzoli, A., "SWWR>Y i Jamšēd-o SWWR>Y i Dāhāk", Jašn Nāmāh i ʔUstād i Muxammad i Muqaddam, (Majallāh i Dāniškudāh i ʔAdabiyāt-o ʔUlūm i ʔInsāni, Sumārah 4, Sāl 23, Zamīstān 2535 i Sāhīnšāhī), 48-50
- Tafazzoli 1984: Tafazzoli, A., "Observations sur le soi-disant *Mazdak-Nāmāg*", Acta Iranica 23, 507-510
- Tafazzoli 1364h.š. (1985): Tafazzoli, A., Mīnū-ye-Xīrad, Tehrān (2nd edition; 1st edition: Tafazzoli 1354h.š. (1975): Tafazzoli, A., Mīnū-ye-Xīrad, *Enteshārāt-e Bonyād-e Farhang-e Irān*, Tehrān)
- Tafazzoli 1988: Tafazzoli, A., "The King's Seat in the Fire-Temple", Acta Iranica 28 (Homages et Opera Minora XII, A Green Leaf, سبک سبز, Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen), Leiden, 101-106
- Tafazzoli 1989a: Tafazzoli, A., "Iranian Notes", Cahier de Studia Iranica 7, 367-70
- Tafazzoli 1989b: Tafazzoli, A., "Did Spāndārmad Marry Afrāsiāb?", Iran-Nameh 7.2, 190-202
- Tafazzoli 1990: Tafazzoli, A., "Pahlavica III", Acta Orientalia 51, 47-60
- Tafazzoli 1991: Tafazzoli, A., "L'inscription funéraire de Kāzerun II (Parišān)", Studia Iranica 20, 197-202
- Tafazzoli 1992: Tafazzoli, A., "Dādestān ī Mēnōg ī Xrad", Elr 6, 554-5
- Tafazzoli 1993a, A., "Quelques mots savants d'origine pehlevie dans le *Sāhnāme*", Studia Iranica, 22, 7-13
- Tafazzoli 1993b: Tafazzoli, A., "Dabīr, Dabīrī", Elr 6, 540-541
- Tafazzoli & Amuzgar 1993c: Tafazzoli, A., & Amūzgār, Z., Ustūra-ye Zindaqī-ye Zardušt, Tehrān
- Tafazzoli 1995a, A., "Kawī Waēpa", Studia Iranica 24, 295-6

- Tafazzoli 1995b, A., "Un chapitre du *Denkard* sur les guerriers", Res Orientalia VII: Moyen Orient: Carrefour des grandes religions, Volume in Honour of Philippe Gignoux, Paris, 287-302
- Taqizadeh 1940: Taqizadeh, S.H., "The 'Era of Zoroaster'", JRAS, 33-40
- Tardieu 1982: Tardieu, M., Le Manichéisme, Que sais-je?, Paris
- Tardieu 1986: Tardieu, M., "Šābiens coraniques et 'Šābiens' de Harrān", JA 274, 1-44
- Tardieu 1988: Tardieu, M., "La diffusion du bouddhisme dans l'empire kouchan, l'Iran et la Chine après un Kephalaion manichéen inedit", Studia Iranica 17, 154-82
- Tavadia 1930: Tavadia, J., Sāvast-nē-šāvast: A Pahlavi Text on Religious Customs, Hamburg
- Tavadia 1931: Tavadia, J.C., "Studia Indo-Iranica", Ehrensache für Wilhelm Geiger, Leipzig, 239-49
- Tavadia 1956a: Tavadia, J.C., Indo-Iranian Studies II, Santiniketan
- Tavadia 1956b: Tavadia, J.C., Die mittelpersische Sprache und Literatur der Zarathustrier, iranische Texte und Hilfsbücher hrsg. v. H.F.J. Junker 2, Leipzig
- Thomson 1978: Thomson, R.W., Moses Khorenats'i: History of the Armenians, Harvard University Armenian Texts and Studies, 4, Cambridge, Mass.
- Thomson 1996: Thomson, R.W., Rewriting Caucasian History: The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles. The Original Georgian Texts and the Armenian Adaptation. Translated with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford
- Toll 1970: Toll, Ch., "Die Aramäischen Ideogramme im Mittelpersischen", Altorientalistik und Semitistik 25-45
- Tolman 1919: Tolman, H.C., "A Possible Restoration from a Middle Persian Source of the Answer of Jesus to Pilate's Inquiry 'What is Truth?'" , JAOS 39, 55-57
- Tolstov 1948: Толстов, С.П., Древний Хорезм. Опыт историко-археологического исследования, Москва
- Tsereteli 1943: Церетели, Г.В., "Надпись времен грузинского царя Митридата из Армази. Опыт перевода и интерпретации текста", Тезисы X сессии отделения общественных наук Груз. ССР, 18-19
- Tsereteli 1962: Церетели, Г.В. "Армзская надпись эпохи Митридата Иверийского", Труды международного конгресса востоковедов, 9-16 августа 1960 г., Москва, 1 (1962), 374-377
- Tsereteli 1994: Tsereteli, K., "Aramaic Language in Georgia", The Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies Held by The World Union of Jewish Studies, ed. by D. Assaf, Jerusalem, 9-16
- Tsui Chi 1943-46: Tsui Chi, "MO NI CHIAO HSIA PU TSAN 'The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichéan Hymns'", BSOAS 11, 174-218
- Tucci 1971: Tucci, G., "Iran e Tibet", Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 marzo - 5 aprile 1970), Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLXVIII - 1971, Quaderno N.160, Problemi attuali di scienza e di cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 355-360

Tur-Sinai 1967: Tur-Sinai, N.H., The Book of Job: A New Commentary, Jerusalem

Unvála 1917: Unvála, M.R., Der Pahlavi Text "Der König Husrav und sein Knabe", herausgegeben, umschrieben, übersetzt und erläutert, Wien

Unvála 1922: Unvála, M.R., Dáráb Hormazvār's Rivāyat, I-II, Bombay

Unvála 1924: Unvála, J.M., Neryosangh's Sanskrit Version of the Hōm Yašt (Yasn IX-XI) with the Original Avesta and its Pahlavi Version, Wien

Utas 1976: Utas, Bo, "Non-Religious Book Pahlavi Literature as a Source to the History of Central Asia", AAASH 24, 115-124

Utas 1988: Utas, Bo (ed.), Frahang i Pahlavīk, from the posthumous papers of Henrik Samuel Nyberg, with the collaboration of Christopher Toll, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden

Vahman 1983: Vahman, F., "A Beautiful Girl", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce), Leiden, 665-671

Vahman 1986: Vahman, F., Arđā Wirāz Nāmag, The Iranian II'Divina Commedia', Curzon Press, London & Malmo

Vaillant 1952: Vaillant, A., Le Livre des Secrets d'Enoch, Paris

Vasmer 1950: Vasmer, M., Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch vol. I (1950-1958; reprint 1976, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag)

Vasmer 1967: Фасмер, М., Этимологический Словарь Русского Языка, перевод с немецкого и дополнения О.И. Трубничко, "Прогресс", Москва

Veselovskij 1879: Веселовский, А.Н., "Слово о Даѣнадцати Снах Шахаиши по ркл. XV вѣка", Записки Российской Императорской Академии Наукъ 34.2, 1-15

von Voigtlander 1978: von Voigtlander, E., The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part I, Inscriptions of Ancient Iran; Vol. II The Babylonian Versions of the Achaemenian Inscriptions, Texts I, London

Vullers 1962: Vullers, J.A., Lexicon Persico-Latinum etymologicum, Graz [reprint; 1st edition: I, 1855; II, 1864; III, 1867]

Waag 1941, A., Nirangistan. Der Awestatraktat über die rituellen Vortschritten, Iranische Forschungen 2, hrs. von H.H. Schaeder, Leipzig [reviewed in Tavadia 1944]

Wansbrough 1977: Wansbrough, J., Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation, Oxford

Watson 1983: Watson, W., "Iran and China", The Cambridge History of Iran 3(1), The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 537-558

Weryho 1971: Weryho, J.W., "Syriac Influence on Islamic Iran (The evidence of loanwords)", Folia Orientalia XIII, 299-321

West & Haug 1874: West E.W., and Haug, M., Glossary and Index of the Pahlavi Texts of the Book of Arda Viraf, Bombay-London

West 1871: West, E.W., The Book of Mainyo-i Khard, Stuttgart and London

West 1880: West, E.W., The Bundahis Bahman Yast, and Shāyast Lā-Shāyast, Pahlavi Texts, Part I, Sacred Books of the East, edited by F.M. Müller, V, Oxford

West 1882: West, E.W., The Dādstān-i Dinik and The Epistles of Mānūskhar, Pahlavi Texts, Part II, Sacred Books of the East, edited by F.M. Müller, XVIII, Oxford

West 1885: West, E.W., The Dīnā-i minōg-i khard, Skand-gūmānik Vicār, Sad dar, Pahlavi Texts, Part III, Sacred Books of the East, edited by F.M. Müller, XXIV, Oxford

West 1887: West, E.W., "Notes sur quelques petits textes pehlevi", Le Muséon 6, 263-272

West 1892: West, E.W., Contents of the Nasks, Pahlavi Texts, Part IV, Sacred Books of the East, edited by F.M. Müller, XXXVII, Oxford (reprint: Delhi 1969)

West 1897: West, E.W., Marvels of the Zoroastrianism, Pahlavi Texts Part V, Sacred Books of the East, edited by F.M. Müller, XLVII, Oxford (reprint: Delhi 1969)

West 1904a: West, E.W., The Pahlavi Jāmāsp-Nāmak, So far as it was extant in 1876 in a very old Manuscript belonging to the late Shams-ul-Ulama Dastur Dr. Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana, Avesta, Pahlavi and Ancient Persian Studies in Honour of D.P.B. Sanjana, 1st ser., Straßburg-Leipzig, 97-116

West 1904b: West, E.W., "Pahlavi Literature", Grundriss der iranischen Philologie II, hrsg. v. K.F. Geldner und E. Kuhn, Strassburg, 75-129

West 1916: West, E.W., "A Translation and Transliteration of the Pahlavi Treatise 'Wonders of Sagastān' (Sīstān)", ed. by A.V. Williams Jackson, JAS 36, 115-21

Westergaard 1851: Westergaard, N.L., Bundahesh. Liber pehlevicus, Ex veustissimo codice Copenhageniensi descriptus, Havniae

Westergaard 1852-54: Westergaard, N.L., Zend Avesta or the the Sacred Religious Book of the Zoroastrians, I, Copenhagen

Widengren 1938: Widengren, G., Hochgottglaube im alten Iran, Uppsala-Leipzig

Widengren 1946: Widengren, G., Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism, Univ. A*rsskr. 3, King and Savior II, Uppsala-Leipzig

Widengren 1960: Widengren, G., Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit, Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Geisteswissenschaften, Heft 70, Westdeutscher Verlag, Köln & Opladen

Widengren 1967: Widengren, G., "Primordial man and Prostitute: A Zervanite Motif in the Sassanid Avesta", Studies in Mysticism and Religion. Festschrift Gershom Scholem, Jerusalem, 337-352

Widengren 1968: Widengren, G., "The Problem of the Sasanian Avesta", Holy Book and Holy Tradition, ed. by F.F. Bruce & E.G. Rup, Manchester, 36-53

Widengren 1983a: Widengren, G., "Leitende Ideen und Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik", Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. D. Hellholm, Tübingen 1983, 77-162

Widengren 1983b: Widengren, G., "Manichaeism and its Iranian Background", The Cambridge History of Iran 3(2), The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 965-990

Widengren 1983c: Widengren, G., "La rencontre avec la daēnā, qui représente les actions de l'homme", Orientalia Romana 5, ed. Gh. Gnoli, Roma, 60?

Wikander 1938: Wikander, S., Der arische Männerbund. Studien zur indo-iranischen Sprach- und Religionsgeschichte, Lund

Wikander 1941: Wikander, S., Vayu I. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Indo-Iranischen Religionsgeschichte, Lund

Wikander 1946: Wikander, S., Feuerpriester in Kleinasien und Iran, Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 40, Lund

Wikander 1951: Wikander, S., "Hethitiska Myter hos Greker och Perser", VetenskapSocietetens i Lund Årsbok, 39-56

Wikander 1952: Wikander, S., "Histoire des Ouranides", Cahiers du Sud 314, Marseille, 9-17

Wikander 1960: Wikander, S., "Ein Fest bei den Kurden und im Avesta", Orientalia Suecana 9, 7-10

Wilkins Smith 1929: Wilkins Smith, M., Studies in the Syntax of the Gathas of Zarathushtra Together with the Text, Translations, and Notes, Language Dissertations Published by the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia

Williams 1985: Williams, A.V., "A Strange Account of the World's Origin: PRDd XLVI", Acta Iranica 25 (dixième série, *Hommages et Opera Minora XI. Paper in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*), Leiden, 683-697

Williams 1990: Williams, A.V., The Pahlavi Rivayat Accompanying the Dadeestan i Denig. v.1-2, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 60:1, Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Copenhagen

Wolff 1910: Wolff, F., Avesta, die heiligen Bücher der Parsen, auf der Grundlage von Ch. Bartholomae's Altiranischen Wörterbuch übersetzt, Strassburg

Yarshater 1971: Yarshater, E., "Were the Sasanians Heirs to the Achaemenids?", Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 marzo - 5 aprile 1970), Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLXVIII - 1971, Quaderno N.160, Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 517-531

Yarshater 1983: Yarshater, E., "Mazdakism", The Cambridge History of Iran 3(2), The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, London etc., 991-1025

Yutaka Yoshida 1983: Yutaka Yoshida, "Manichaean Aramaic in the Chinese Hymnscroll", BSOAS 46, 326-331

Zaehner 1937-39: Zaehner, R.C., "Zurvanica I-III", BSOS 9, 303-320, 573-585, 871-901

Zaehner 1939-42: Zaehner, R.C., "A Zervanite Apocalypse I-II", BSOS 10, 377-98, 606-31

Zaehner 1955: Zaehner, R.C., Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma, Oxford

Zaehner 1961: Zaehner, R.C., The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism, London

Zand 1988: Zan'd, M., "Hiṭyaššūi hayyahūdīm bə'Asyāh hattīkōnah bīmēy qedem ubīmēy habbēynayyim hammuqdāmīm", Pā'āmīm I"h (35), 4-23 (Hebrew)

מ. זנדי, "יהודים וזרואסטריות באסיה הקטנה בימי קדם ובזמן הביניים המוקדמים", פאמ'ים ל"ה (1988), עמ' 4-23

Zarrīnkūb 1975: Zarrīnkūb, 'Abd al-Husain, "The Arab Conquest of Iran and its Aftermath", The Cambridge History of Iran. The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Saliugs, Vol. 4, ed. R.N. Frye, Cambridge, 1-56

Zotenberg 1869: Zotenberg, H., "Geschichte Daniels. Ein Apokryph", Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testamentes I, 385-427

בפרק ד' דן היסטוריה האיראנית כפי שהיא משתקפת באספקלריה של המיתוס המשתמר בזנים. נסקרות צמיחה של מיתוסים היסטוריים חדשים בתקופה הסאסאנית המאוחרת ובאותה התקופה הסאסאנית. כמו כן, בפרק זה תוארכו מספר טקסטים פהלויים מאוחרים. הפרק פותח בסקירה על הקטעים האפוקליפטיים והאסכולוגיים במפרות הפהלויות. סוגת הנבואות כביכול לאחר מעשה הזאת היא הרובד הכמעט יחיד בו נשתמרו התייחסויות להיסטוריה. הסוגה הזאת גם רוויה במטיבים הלוקחים מתעמלה פליטית שלעמים עובדה לצרכים של הצד שכנגד. בתחילת הפרק מרכה השוואה ממצה בין שתי מסורות דומות, אך שונות, המפיעות בחיבור בשם זנדי והמן סין / ישות וגדולה השאלה, אם תסכים המצוטטים בחיבור זה הם אכן ממקורותיו של החיבור. נכון החקשר המזרח-תיכוני הרחב של מסורות בין תקופות היסטוריות מסוגלות על ידי מתכות; בדרך השתלכות המאחרות המכוונות כנגד מיתאנו של מדאק. מדינשת המגמה הדו-ערכית של הסאסאנים להשתמש בציפיות האפוקליפטיות שרווחו בתקופתם, בכדי לבסס את שלטונם מחד, ובזמנית, להרגיע ולהשקט את המתח האסכולוגי מאידך. מדונה בהרחבה השאלה של "יוזף הכרונולוגיה" הסאסאנית, שנבעה מהמגמה הדו-ערכית הזאת. תוך כדי הדיון בטקסטים המתייחסים למיעויות הדתיות, נדונו הבעיות השוליות מניחות קטע מפרק 33 של הגנדהן, חיבור פהלוי מאוחר שמקורותיו עתיקים. קטע זה הוא שרירי לחיבור היסטורי מהטיפוס של "קידאי טאג", "ספר המלאכים" הסאסאני. ניתוח קטע זה מוביל למטיבים על אודות פלישות עמים תורכיים, הביונטיים הנוצרים ואחרים לתוך ממלכת איראן. המטחים המשמשים לציון הפולשים והאויבים לקוחים מזנים לסקסטים אוסטיים, וניתוח מפורט של הזמנים, מקורם האוסטי והטקסטים המשניים כפהלווי (זוגמת הספרות האפוקליפטית-האסכולוגית) מדגימים את הטבעת הידשה הספרותית בתוך סוגה שעיקר עמינה תעמלה פליטית. הדמוניזציה של האויבים הפליטיים והלאומיים קיבלה צורה של פרשנות כביכול על קטעים נבואיים של האוסטא.

קטעי תעמלה ומיתולוגיזציה של היסטוריה ניתן לראות גם בטקסטים פסוידו-נבואיים מאוחרים אחרים, כך, בחיבור קצר ששתי גרסאותיו מנותחות בהרחבה, "בואו של המלך והראם", ניתן לחוות תעמלה לאומית-פטריוטית של הנסיכים הסאסאניים שהקים אחרי נפילת הממלכה לידי הערבים מדינה במזרח איראן בחסות סין של שושלת תאנג. מנותחים התייחסויות היסטוריות ואתנוגרפיות לעמים שונים בקטעי הספרות הסאסאנית הגיאוגרפית, ולבסוף, מפרקים שני הרבדים השונים של חיבור בשם גיאמאסאט נאמג בזיקתם למטיבים הנסקרים לעיל, וקודם כל, לאלה המציינים ב- זנדי והמן סין / ישות. בפרק זה נטען שהקטעים הפסוידו-היסטוריים של תעמלה העוטה מעטה של נבואה אפוקליפטית תוארים למדי אמתניים ויכולים להיות מתוארכים. בספח "שאכאישא" לפרק ד' שופיע ככרך השני נדונים יחסי הגומלין בין מספר טקסטים זורואסטריים (בפהלווי ובפרסית), טקסט סלאבית כנסייתית עתיקה ובזיקתם, כביכול, לחיבור טיבטי.

זנדי עבר כבדת דרך ארוכה מתרגום בין השיטין המילולי שמטרתו לסייע בהבנת המקור האוסטי כזוהי היה עדין נהיר במידת-מה, אך לא די צורכך, מבחינה לשונית, עד שהתרגום התנתק מהטקסט האוסטי והחל חי חיים משלו. השפה האוסטית מנשתה מובנת פחות ופחות עדין הטקסט האוסטי נתפס יותר ויותר כערך קטני ודווקא עקב אי-בהירותו נטף לו טפח של קדושה יותר המכילה את החכמה הכלית.

הנוסח הפהלווי טפג גלוסות רבות שמשו לחלק האנטגראלי והעניקו לו כיוונים חדשים ומגמת שונות. עם הזמן, הסתמנה המגמה של הווענקות של הגרסא הפהלוית מהגרסא האוסטית, הנוסח הפהלווי עבר שידורו תכוף, אך בכל זאת, בהרבה מקרים אנוח יכולים רק לחשומם נוכח ידיעותיהם המופלגות של בעלי חזק בשפה האוסטית ודיוקם בתרגומם. הזנדיים ניסו לתפוס משהו מהחיבטים השונים של החכמה הכלית של האוסטא, ולכן התפתחו שלוש אסכולות מקבילות של קריאה של הנוסח האוסטי יחד עם הנוסח הפהלווי במקביל, אסכולות שהתרכזו במנים, או רשות, השונים של הבנה.

כך, אחת האסכולות הללו הכניסה מטיבים מיתיים, מיתולוגיים ואגדתיים לתוך הטקסט של גרסתם (והזנדינג מכל). יש לציון שהפרשנות הסאסאנית מלאה דמיון רב לפנים מסוימים של הפרשנות ההודוית (והמטוריינית), כמו פשט, רמן, מדרש אנדה ועוד. השוואה שיטתית של קווי הדמיון הללו ראוייה למחקר מקיף.

העבודה כוללת מספר אטימולוגיות בשפות שונות. בעבודה מובאים מקורות בפהלתי, אוסטיית, פרסית קלאסית ובפרסית-יהודית, ערבית, מגדעית, ארמנית, גרווינית, סלאבית כנסייתית עתיקה, טיבטית, טטקריט, קופטית. בביליוגרפיה מובאים יותר מ-600 פריטים בשפות שונות.

במילים אחרות, חוקר חמד צריך לטפל בי-זמנית כמה רמות: מה היה מובע של הטקסט הארוסטי, במיוחד האנטי, כפי שמבחר (וורואסטריז) היטל; כיצד הוא הובן על ידי המסורות המאורות והמחקר של הזמן החדש; כיצד הוא הובן על ידי ארבע הנרסאות הפהלויות המכרות?

הטקסטים הארוסטיים והפהלוים שימשו שתי מטרות שונות: הראשונים נעזד ליהנות בכל פה בצורה המשלמת בהיותם פתח ובוזה היה כוחם, כאשר האחרונים נעזד להבנה. לכן הפרשנות התפתחה בשפות הדבורות, והפרשנות הפהלויות מייצגת, ככל הנראה, רק אחת המסורות פרשניות (למרות שכמעט ללא ספק, המפותחות והעשירה ביותר שבהן), והדבר הצריך תזלזול והטח המפרע על הכתב.

בעבודה נסקרות תיאוריות שונות בדבר השלבים המקדמים של הפרשנות, סוגיות הכתב הפהלווי והתפתחותן, סוגיות הפעולות הכתב הארוסטי הכרות בכך, סוגיות הטח הקדום של הארוסטי שנשמר, כביכול, במקום מסוים באיראן (יחד הכתובים), או "פצרות הכתובים", מסורות על אודות שרפתה של הארוסטי על ידי אלכסנדר מוקדון והצבע מכך.

ניתן חסר למצוא היסוד כמו זנ, דן, אונסטא, ומצעות פרשניות חדשות של המצעים, כמו כן, מנותחים כמה קטעים של זנ מתקופות שונות. למבוא נעספה "הערה נוספת" (4 עמודים) הדנה דיון פילולוגי בקבוצה מסוימת אליה התייחסתי בגוף המבוא.

פרק א' דן בסוגיות העלות מנטחו ותוכנו של הספר השמיני של הדיבר שעינקו סיכום תפקידים (ימסכתות) הארוסטיים. הפרק נוסד על הטח של של פרק המבוא (פרק א') של הספר השמיני של הדיבר, אשר בו מתמצתים כל 21 הנככים הארוסטיים. הנככים חולקו שתי חלקות בי-זמניות מקבילות שונות לשלוש קבוצות, כאשר בכל קבוצה שבעה נככים. בניאר הנככים בספר השמיני של הדיבר לא הוקצנה שימת לב שווה לכל נכך. שלוש הנככים מחסוג נאמיג, דהיינו הנככים שחזקו, נקשטמאקסד, נג, תומצנו בספר השמיני של הדיבר בכמה שורות בלבד. אלה הם הנככים המנומצתים בהרחבה בהמשך הדיבר, ותקציר תוכנם נופס את כל הספר התשיעי של הדיבר. לכן ברור שהצגתם המנומקצרת ביותר בתחילת הספר השמיני של הדיבר נבעה מכך שהמחבר-המתמצת התכוון מראש לטטוח את תוכנם בצורה הנרחבת בהמשך.

במקרה אחר, המחבר-המתמצת של הספר השמיני של הדיבר שטח בהרחבה את תוכנו של הנכך נקמילדא, שהוא הנכך היחיד מכל 21 הנככים המקוריים שהגיע לידנו הן בצורתו הארוסטית, הן בצורתו הפהלוית. רק במקרה של הנכך הזה אנו יכולים להשוות בין המקור הארוסטי, נרסו הפהלויות ותמציתו במיגד, ולהסיק מכך מסקנות לגבי טאמנותה של מלאכת התימצות של המחבר של הספר השמיני של הדיבר.

נככים אחדים אבדו כבר בזמן של המחבר של הספר השמיני של הדיבר ולכן אנו יכולים לשפט על סיכום רק מעודדות הלא-ישירות. מכל מקום, מחבר הפרק הראשון של הספר השמיני של הדיבר עיבד, ככל הנראה, חיבור עתיק יותר של הנככים חולקו לשלוש קבוצות, לפי אחד ההיבטים שבא בהם לידי ביטוי (הלכתי, אגדתי-מדרשי, הלכתי-מדרשי) שחזקו לשלושה סוגים של תודעה דתית.

בפרק זה הוצע ניתוח מדויק של תוכנם של הנככים יחד עם השערות בדבר מוצאם והרצאת מקבילותיהם.

פרק ב' ושמו "דרכו של זנ" מדגים דרך שני הדגמות את המגמות בפרשניות של אותו הטקסט הארוסטי על ידי ארבע גרסאותיו הפרשניות, ומתייחס לחומר הרב המסתעף מפרשניות אלה. הפרק הזה חשוב להבנת שיטתי, כי בו הצגתי שיטה של קריאה בי-זמנית משלבת של כל הטקסטים הפהלוים המתייחסים ליחידה אוסטיית אחת. החלק הראשון של הפרק נסב מסיבב לסט 45. פרט לרסותה הפהלויות הישירה של הקטנה (ייסנט הפהלויות) שמנתחת רק בחלקה, מנתחות שלוש הנרסאות המתמצותות בספר התשיעי של הדיבר. מבין השלש, נעדה גרסת הנג נכך הליגנאליסטית ל-החלונים, ואילו גרסת הןקשטמאקסד נכך הליגנאליסטית-מיסטית נעדה למשכילים. לדעת, תפיסת המקור הארוסטי על ידי הנרסא האחרונה הזאת היא הקרובה ביותר לסט הפהלויות ולכונותיו של הנביא וורואסטר. גרסתו של הסתגד נכך היא מדרשית-אגדית והיא מכניסה מימד של מתולוגיזציה לתוך פרשנות היסט. מכיוון שהמטיבים המופיעים בסתגד נכך נעשו פורסמים במסורות איראניות הבתר-סאסאניות, אולי היתה גרסא זאת הפוצה ביותר ולכן שרידה משתפר גם לאחר איסלמה של איראן.

החלק השני של הפרק נעזד להדגים שהנאמר על היחס בין ארבע הנרסאות הפהלויות של אותו טקסט אוסטי אינו חריג ואינו מאפיין רק מקרה של יסנט מחוזות אחת. במרכז החלק השני עומדות פרשניות על יסנט 51, ייסנט של השלטון הטוב, והסתעפותותיה. גם במקרה זה (וזה הכלל) מגמתיה של שלוש הנרסאות המתמצותות בספר התשיעי של הדיבר אינן שונות מהנאמר לעיל על מגמתיהם של הנג נכך, הןקשטמאקסד נכך, הסתגד נכך.

הנתיא של השלטון הטוב עוסקת, מצד, ברדנות, רעיון "השלטון הטוב" היה מרכזי בחשיבה הדתית-פוליטית של איראנים, במיוחד בסוף התקופה הסאסאנית הדויה בדיכוי מיניות, מלחמת פנים ופלישות השכנים. תשומת לב מחוזת נחנה כאן לגינות גרסת הסתגד נכך המדרשית-אגדית ולהשוואת למקבילותיה מחוץ לטאניא, לייחוסו של הדקדן איי-דהאב, לניתוח הטקסטים המסתעפים מייחוס, דהיינו, טקסטים המטפלים בהומוסקסואליות, בדרקונים ובמסורות על אודות פידיון, גיבור מתולוגי מכניע של אזי-דהאב. נוסף על אלה ניתוח מסורות וורואסטוריות פטוידו-היסטוריות על אודות יהודים וכיבוש ירושלים ותימן. סוף הפרק מביל עמידה על היחס של המסורות הזורואטוריות והסאסאניות המאוחות להצגת הדת והשלטון האיראניים בעולם הנושג בולו וביחס ההלכתי לנככים.

תקציר

העבודה הזאת כוללת סדרת מחקרים בספרות הזנדה, כלומר, בספרות הפרשנות הזורואסטרית המסורתית בשפה הפרסית-אמצעית (או פהלווי) על כתבי הקודש בשפה האווסטית העתיקה. היא מבוססת, בעיקרה, על עשרות טקסטים בפהלווי ובאווסטית; חלק מהטקסטים המופיעים בעבודה מעולם לא פורסמו כמקובל בתעתיק ולא תורגמו, אחרים מופיעים בקריאות ובתרגום חדשים. כאן נדונים ומתפרסמים בתעתיק ובתרגום אנלי חלקים נכבדים של הספרים השמיני והתשעי של זיגבד, שהוא ההיבור הזורואסטרי הנדול ביותר בפרסית האמצעית ומתחזרים החשובים בספרות הזאת. שני הספרים האלה של הזיגבד מהווים סקירה ותמצית בפהלווי של הקטן האווסטי, במי שהוא היה ידוע בשלהי התקופה הסאסאנית וזמן-מה אחריה. כמו כן מתפרסמים, באותו האופן, קטעים מהתרגומים הפהלוויים למאמצי האווסטית, לב ליבה של הספרות הזורואסטרית המקודשת. בתור שכזאת, העבודה הנכחית היא הראשונה מסוגה. רוב הטקסטים הניתנים בתעתיק הלטיני ובתרגום האנגלי כללים בכך השני (נספחים) של עבודת הדוקטור הזאת. והכרך השני מכיל גם כמה מחקרים עצמאיים לא גדולים המטפלים במיוחד יתר בכמה מהסוגיות המזכרות בצף עבודת הדוקטור.

הטקסטים הפהלוויים האלה הם בעלי חשיבות עליונה להבנת המסורת הזורואסטרית מהתקופה הסאסאנית המאוחרת, כי המסורת הזאת נסדה על הגרסה הפהלווית של הקטן האווסטי. חוקר הזנדה עומד בפני בעיות ייחודיות: הוא בא ללמוד את הפרשנות, אבל פרשנות של מה? אפילו בימינו, אחרי יותר ממאה שנות מחקר מורה, הטקסטים האווסטיים נותרים במידת-מה מיסטוריים גם לחוקרי האווסטא, ובייחוד הדברים אמורים בגאנתיא, החלק המרכזי (נורתי משמם) והמקודש ביותר של הקורפוס האווסטי. אסכולה אחת בחקר האווסטא נטתה לקרוא את הטקסטים הללו בעיני התרגומים הפהלוויים שגלב העבודה הנכחית, כלומר קראה את האווסטא באמצעות תרגומה הפהלווי, ובכך טנתה אמונה רב במסורת, כאשר האסכולה השנייה ביכרה להדגיש את הויקה ההנדו-אירופית, ובמיוחד ההודית, של האווסטא, ולהמעיט בצדק התרגום הפהלווי. לכן, חוקר התרגומים הפהלוויים של האווסטא צריך בראשונה לקבוע את עמדתו שלו כלפי הטקסטים האווסטיים. בדרך זאת, העבודה עצמה הופכת מיניה וביה למחקר לא רק בטקסטים הפהלוויים אלא גם באווסטא, וקביעת העמדה כלפי משמעות הפשט של הטקסט האווסטי משליכה מיד על ההערכה של פרשנותו הפהלווית.

בעיות קשות נובעות לא רק מהעדר הסכמה בין חוקרים לגבי פשטו של הטקסט האווסטי אליו מתייחסות הפרשנות בפרסית האמצעית, אלא גם מסיב הכתב ומחמבה הלשוני של השפה בה פורשו הטקסטים (פהלווי). תיאורטית, לא אחת הטקסט הפהלווי יכול להקרא ולהיות מתועתק בשלל דרכים. בטקף לכך, מלבד הגרסה הפהלווית של הטקסט הגאנתי, שהיא עצמה מלאה בגלוטות שגשגות בתקופות שונות ומקשות על הכנת הטקסט, קיימות שלוש פאראפראזות פרשניות בעלות מנגנון שונות שנשתמרו בתוך הספר התשעי של הזיגבד ואף הן מספקות לעתים קריאות והבנות שצריכות להילקח בחשבון בההדרה של הגרסה הפהלווית לאווסטא מלא.

תוכן הענינים

li-i	מבוא
iv-iii	הערה נוספת
40-1	פרק א' סיכום של נסכים: שקיעין של האוסטא הסאסאנית ב-דינברד 8
83-41	פרק ב' דרכו של זנד: בחינת כמה גרסאות פהלוניות של מקור אנוסטי אחד
144-84	פרק ג' סוגיות נבחרות ב-זנד: מסורות יוצאות-דופן
93-84	א' שנה ו-זעה
104-94	ב' אריש ו-מהמי
134-105	ג' מאני ו-זנד
144-135	ד' אש
197-145	פרק ד' זנד והיסטוריה: אקטואליזציה של מיתוסים בתקופה הסאסאנית ואחריה
198	סיכום ומסקנות
200-199	קיצורים
241-201	ביבליוגרפיה
א-י	תקציר עברי

Studies in Zoroastrian Exegesis: Zand

Thesis submitted for the degree "Doctor of Philosophy"

by Dan Shapira

submitted to the Senate of the Hebrew University of

תשנ"ט / Jerusalem in 1998

APPENDICES

a
CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER I</u>	1-62
APPENDIX I	1-48
APPENDIX II	49-54
APPENDIX III	55-60
APPENDIX IV	61-62
 <u>CHAPTER II</u> APPENDIX I	 63-116
 <u>CHAPTER III</u>	 117-187
I Sleep and Sweat APPENDIX I	117-129
APPENDIX II Sadwēs	130-133
II Ariš and Mahmt APPENDIX II	134-136n
III Mānī and Zand APPENDIX I Biblical Quotes	137-146
III Mānī and Zand APPENDIX II Fragān	147-151
III Mānī and Zand APPENDIX III Hārūt wa Mārūt	152-156
III Mānī and Zand APPENDIX IV	157-158
IV Fire APPENDIX	159-187
 <u>CHAPTER IV</u>	 188-238
APPENDIX I	188-234
APPENDIX II Saxaiša	235-238

1
CHAPTER I
APPENDIX I

Dk 8.1: DkM 677.1-680.7; DKS XV.1, 1ff.; DkD 526.4-528. 21; West 1892, 3-10; Molé 1963, 61ff., Cereti 1997, 97-101:

1. spās ī Ohrmazd ud niyāyīšn ī Dēn ī Mazdēšn ī jud dēw Ohrmazd dādestān.
2. haštom, abar hangirdīgīh ī hān ī andar Naskīhā ī Dēn ī Mazdēšn jud jud.
3. ēdar ayād ī hān ī andar šādōrwān ī ēn nāmāg abar ōsmurišn ī Weh Dēn ō āgāhīh ī wasān nibišt ud niwēyēnīd
az Zand [hān ī Dēn] pad āgāh dahišnīh¹ ī ō ēd pāyram dastwar, pad xVad ewāz ī Dēn nibišt.
4. be pēš az hān, nibištān ēwān abar ōsmurišn ī Dēn ī Mazdēšn bazišn, uš bazišn, bahr, ud bahr brīnag nimūdan; ōsmurišn kē kš hangirdīgtar padaš bazišn, hangirdīg pad bahr īš bazišn, ud wistarišnīgtar pad brīnag ī bahr.
5. ōsmurišn ī Dēn ī Mazdēšn bazišn 3: Gāθān ī hast *abērtar² mēnōg.dānišnīh mēnōg.kārīh, Dād ī hast abērtar gēttg.dānišnīh gēttg.kārīh, ud Hāθō[k].Mānōr ī hast abērtar āgāhīh ud kār ī abar hān ī mīyān ēd 2.
6. ud cīm ī 3 bazišnīh ī Dēn ōsmurišn nigēz hast ī wisp.dānišn, kār ud ēwēnag ī ham Dēn dānišn ud kunišn; ēd ī 3 nibišt ōhaz Ahunvar ī Dēn ōsmurišn bun3 gāh.
7. hān ī fradom Gāθānīgīh, ud hān ī diūtgar Hāθō[k].Mānōrīgīh ud hān ī sidīgtar Dādīh abērtar nimāyēd.
8. ūš hāt hēnd bazišn bahr 21 ī xVānThēnd Nask.

1 There is no need to emend to *āgāhēnišnīh, "erudizione", as Cereti did.
2 Cf. Shaked 1969, 181.

- 1.¹ Gratitude to Ohrmazd and praise to the Mazda-worshipping Religion, the Law² of Ohrmazd, breaking off³ with dēws!
2. The Eighth [book], about the summary of what occurs in the Nasks of the Mazda-worshipping Religion, each one separately.
3. Here the memory of that which is in the pond⁴ of this book concerning the categories⁵ of the Good Religion was written down and announced, for the knowledge of many, from the Zand [which is Avesta (Dēn)]⁶, written as an authority for the commonalty in teaching the wisdom, by the [uttered] word of the Avesta itself⁷.
4. But, before that, there is ordinance⁸ to write about the division of the categories of the Mazda-worshipping Religion, to demonstrate Her divisions, parts, and the sections of the parts; the categories are more summarized in the divisions, summarized in the parts of the divisions, and more detailed in the sections of the parts.
5. The categories of the Mazda-worshipping Religion contain three divisions: Gāθās, which is mainly the *mēnōg* knowledge and action; Dād, which is mainly the *gēttīg* knowledge and action; Hāθā.Mānōr, which is mainly the awareness and action according to what is between these two.
6. And the reason of the triple division of the categories of the Religion is the exposition of Complete Knowledge, Action, and Ordinance of the knowledge and action of the whole Religion; these three are written according to the Ahunvar, which is the source of the categories of the Avesta, in which there are three gāh-s (metrical lines).
7. The first [division] chiefly exposes Gāθīc, the second is Hāθā.Mānōric, and the third is Dādīc [lores].
8. And there are 21 parts of its divisions, which are called Nasks.

1 The formula is found in nearly the same way in Dk 6.1, in a similar way in Dk. 4.1, slightly differently in Dk 9.1, differently Dk 7.1, cf. Shaked 1979, 223.

2 The order of words reversed in English to avoid ambiguity.

3 Bereniste 1970, 42.

4 West 1892, 1: "[within the] compass [of this book]"; Molé 1963, 63: "dans le[tapis (?) [de ce livre]"; Shaked 1969, 192 n. 46: "[within the] binding [of this book]"; Cereti 1997, 99 (and n. 30): "[compresso all'interno dello specchio di questi libri]". My translation is based on MacKenzie 1971 and the New Persian usage.

5 Cf. Shaked, *ibid.*; I use the term in the sense of "status".

6 I take it as a gloss.

7 My translation of the second part, after ":", differs considerably from that of Cereti.

8 West 1892, 1: "usage". I prefer to see here the meaning of arrangement, order, something like New Persian šīh. Both "ordinance" and "usage" are recorded in New Persian.

9. 7. Gāōānīg ud cē ō Gāōān kard ēstēd, ū.šān nām hān-ī. Gāōānīg *Yašt-
nerang³, ī hast Stōd Yašt⁴ ud S[t]ūdgār, Waršt māns⁵ar, Bag⁵, Waštāg,
Hāōōxt, ud hān ī *ō⁶ Gāōānīg kard ēstēd, Spand.

10. ud 7 Hāōō[k]i-Mānōrīg nām: Dāmdād⁷, *Nādar⁸, Pājag,
Raō.ō.dā.ā.ētag⁹, Bariš¹⁰, Kaškīsrāw¹¹, Wištāsp.Sāst¹².

11. ud 7 Dādīg ud cē ō dādīg kard ēstēd, ū.šān nām hān ī dādīg: Nikāiūm,
Duzd.sar.nijad, Hūspāram, Sakāiūm, ud Vendīdād¹³, ud hān ī ō dād pad jūd
šnōmanīh kard ēstēd, Cīhrdād ud Bagān.Yašt¹⁴.

12. ud padīsārag S[t]ūdgār, Waršt māns⁵ar, Bag, Dāmdād, Nātar, Pājag,
Raō.ō.dā.ā.ētag, Bariš, Kaškīsrāw, Wištāsp.Sāst, Waštāg, Cīhrdād, Spand,
Bagān.Yašt, Nikāiūm, Duzd.sar.nijad, Hūspāram, Sakāiūm, Vendīdād,
Hāōōxt, Stōd.Yašt.

13. andar har 3 har 3 hast, andar Gāōānīg Hāōō[k]i-Mānōrīg ud Dādīg, ud
andar Hāōō[k]i.Mānōrīg Gāōānīg ud Dādīg, ud andar Dādīg Gāōānīg ud
Hāōō[k]i.Mānōrīg.

3 I do not accept the emendation of Cereti 199, 98 n. 27 and 99 n. 32.

4 Cereti: Yasn.

5 Cereti: Bay; I follow here Skjærvø 1989a.

6 ZK.

7 The reading of the names of the Nasks from the second up to fifth ones in Molé 1963, 62-3, are slightly different.

8 Cereti: Nāxtar.

9 Cereti: Radwištāiti.

10 The reading of the names of the Nasks from the second up to fifth ones in Molé 1963, 62-3, are slightly different.

11 Cereti: Kaškaysraw.

12 Cereti: Wištāsp Yašt.

13 Or, *Widēwdād*.

14 Cereti: Bayān Yasr; I follow here Skjærvø 1989a.

9. Seven are Gāōic, and those made unto the Gāōās, and their names are those of the invocations⁹
of the Gāōic worship, which are the Stōd.Yašt, the S[t]ūdgār, Waršt māns⁵ar, Bag,
Waštāg, Hāōōxt (Nasks), and that which was made unto Gāōic, the Spand (Nask).

10. And the names of the seven Hāōō.Mānōric are Dāmdād, *Nādar, Pājag,
Raō.ō.dā.ā.ētag, Bariš, Kaškīsrāw, Wištāsp.Sāst.

11. And seven are Dādīc (legal) and those made unto the Dād, and their names are those of the
Dād, and those are the Nikāiūm, Duzd.sar.nijad, Hūspāram, Sakāiūm, and
Vendīdād, and those which are composed for the law with separate propitiations, the Cīhrdād
and Bagān.Yašt.

12. And the sequence¹⁰ is: S[t]ūdgār, Waršt māns⁵ar, Bag, Dāmdād,
Nādar, Pājag, Raō.ō.dā.ā.ētag, Bariš, Kaškīsrāw, Wištāsp.Sāst, Waštāg,
Cīhrdād, Spand, Bagān.Yašt, Nikāiūm, Duzd.sar.nijad, Hūspāram, Sakāiūm,
Vendīdād, Hāōōxt, Stōd.Yašt.

13. In all three (divisions) all three are (found): in the Gāōic are the Hāōō.Mānōric and
Dādīc, in the Hāōō.Mānōric are the Gāōic and Dādīc, in the Dādīc are the Gāōānīg¹¹
and Hāōō.Mānōrīg¹².

9 Pace Cereti, who took this word (Cereti 1997, 99 n. 32) as "[prescrizioni rituali scritte] in pahlavi".

10 MacKenzie 1971, 63, translated this word: "beginning, basis". West: "sequence"; Molé: "ordre";
Cereti: "ordine".

11 I.e., Bagān Yašt.

12 I.e., Cīhrdād.

14. jud jud hān ī x^vad mādiyānīhā ud mādagwarīhā mēhmānīg, ud hān ī did.bahrīg andar āwurd mēhmānīg, ūš cim: andar mēnōg gētīg ud andar gētīg mēnōg ud andar hān ī miyānag ī har 2 har 2 hast.

15. ud paywastan ī frāz ō abdom Hāōō[k].Mānōrīg *Wašttag bahr az Gāōān ciyōn nibišt ī andar paywand ī ō abdom Hāōō[k].Mānōrīg Wištāsp.Sāst¹⁵.

16. Hāōōxt ud Yašt¹⁶ pad paywand ī ō abdom Dād Vendidād cim dahišn¹⁷; gētīg Dād, miyānag Hāōō[k].Mānōrīg ō mēnōg Gāōān, cē mēnōg cim ud ax^v ud bun¹⁸, ud gētīg cimīg ud wiḥānīg, ud bār nōšthēd¹⁹; cimīg ō cim ud wiḥānīg ō ax^v, bār ō bun.

17. ud frajām ī Dād ī hast *Hōm²⁰ abāz ō Gāōān ī hast bun paywastan, nimūnag hast ī abar fradom mēnōgīh Gāōānīh abēzag rāyēnišnīh būd; abdomāz hān bawēd gētīg; ud ciyōn az mēnōg windīhast, frōd āmad²¹ abāz ō mēnōg paywastāgīh.

18. ud cim ī 21 bahrīh ī 3 bazišn ī Dēn ōsmurišn andar wizīdag ī az kardag paydāg; ōhaz 3 gāh ī Ahunvar ī Dēn ōsmurišn bun, hast 21 mārīg.

15 Cereti: Wištāsp Yašt.

16 Cereti 1997, 100 n. 34, identified it with Stōd Yašt / Yasn.

17 West 1892, 8 n. 3: dahišnīh.stīh.dāg, "the production of the wordly creation", another name for the Dāmdād, adopted by Cereti 1997, 100 n. 33. Molé: dahišn, "signifie la création".

18 Molé 1963, 62: mēnōg cim ud wiḥān bun, and so also Cereti, though the text does not support such reading.

19 So West; Molé and Cereti: dahthēt.

20 Written Hōm in Pāzand, and so transliterated and translated by Molé and Cereti; however, West 1892, 8 and n. 4), rightly emended to Hōm. The shift ū (and ō) to *ī was typical for Zoroastrian Persian of Fārs and is a commonplace in MSS, especially in Pāzand, as here. Compare *ahū* in Dk 8.46.2, written *ahū*, notes West 1892, 170 n. 1, "as usual in Iran".

21 Cereti emended to az mēnōg *nišastan frōd āmad; "è discesa dal seggio spirituale".

14. Each separately hosts, especially and essentially, its own, and (also) hosts that what was brought into from other parts, and the cause for it is: that in mēnōg there is gētīg and in gētīg there is mēnōg, and in what is between the two, there are both found.

15. And the linkage of wašttag, a part of the Gāōā, to the end of Hāōā.Mānōrīg, is because it is written in connection with Wištāsp.Sāst, the end of Hāōā.Mānōrīg.

16. The reason of the Hāōōxt and [Stōd] Yašt having been linked to Vendidād, the last Dādic Nask, is contemplation¹³; gētīg being Dād; Hāōā.Mānōrīg being intermediary; Gāōān belonging to mēnōg, as mēnōg is the cause, the vital force (ax^v)¹⁴ and the source, while gētīg is caused and motivated¹⁵, and the fruit is preserved¹⁶; the caused (goes back) to the cause, the motivated to the vital force (ax^v), the fruit to the source.

17. And the linkage of the end of the Dād, which is Hōm, again to the Gāōā, which is the source, is the symbol of the primal mēnōgīh which was the pure Gāōānīh functioning; at the end it will be even gētīg; and as it was obtained from mēnōg, it descended again to the linkage of mēnōg.

18. And the reason of the twenty-one-fold partition of the triple division of the categories of the Avesta is evident from selections from kardags; similarly, the three (gāhs) of the Ahunvar, which is the source of the reckoning¹⁷ of the Avesta, also have twenty one words.

13 For dahišn, "reflection", from Avestan *dah-, "to teach"; dahmā-, "a learned person", cf. Shaked 1982b, 197ff.; compare also Old Georgian dahmani, "kühn, Held", Middle Persian dāhm, "virtuous, pious; a full member of the Mazdean community, initiate", MacKenzie 1971, 24; Dāhmān "rīn", "The Blessing of the Holy ones, a god, Bestower of Justice and Righteousness"; Pāzand dahma, "pious, holy" (Aogm), Nyberg 1974, 38; New Persian duhmān, "evening prayers", Bielmeyer 1985, 37-8. The range of meaning of this Pahlavi word here is, actually, from "contemplation" to "prayer".

14 On this word, cf. Shaked 1974b (and p. 319 n.1-4).

15 I adopted Cereti's understanding of this word.

16 So West.

17 This is the meaning of the word in this passage, as the passage deals with numerical value of the Ahunvar, and thus the word was rendered in Dhabhar 1932, 3 (who translated Dk 8.1.17b-21).

19. ciyōn Ahunvar ī Dēn šmurišn bun, hast 3 gāhī ī 3 bazišnī ī Dēn šmurišn nimūnag, oʔōn 21 mārīgī ī 3. 21 bahrī ēn 3 bazišnī nīmāyēd, ciyōn paydāg kū: "brēhīnīd awē ī wisp.āgāh dādār az har mārīg ē saw ē".

20. *brīnag ī bahr ciyōn hāt ud fragrad ī andar Naskīhā az Dēn gugāhī āgāhī [az yašt .fravahr Zardu(x)št cāšīšn]²² andar Erān.šahr 1000 būd²³ āšnāg.

21. ud pas az wišōbišn az mar ī duš.xVarrah xēšm.kard Alaksandar mad azəš būd ī ēdōn abāz nē windād ī pad dastwar dāštan šāyēst hē²⁴.

22. ud hān ī hufraward Adurbād ī Mahraspandān padaš passaxt kard ud bōxt āšnāg tā čak²⁵ andar mādiyān ī Erān.šahr pad cāšīšn ud pašn dāšt ēstēd.

23. pas az nibištān ī jud jud Nask, kū pad cē abērtar abar gōwēd, abar Nask Nask šmurihēd, ūš hān ī andar hāt hāt ud fragard (fragard š ayābišn rasēd, cē andar ēn mādiyān *xvāš.kunēn²⁶ abāyišnīg gird društāg ē wizārīhēd.

24. be fradom Nask Nask ud kū abar cē gōwēd nibišt ēwen ēdar niwīšīhēd sāmān ī ayābišn nē abdih xvādīh passazag.

22 I take the words in square brackets to be a gloss explaining Dēn.

23 Bailey 1943, 154, and Molé 1963, 63, read here "1000 sār" (Bailey) or "300 sār" (Molé). The text has clearly YHWWNTN, which is, of course, similar to *SNT.

24 My reading is closer to Bailey 1943, 154, and to Macuch 1987, 321, than to that by Cereti 1997.

25 'D ck. Cereti read tš-iz *nūn. However, cf. Shaki 1977, 51 n. 17, who read here čak, "endorsed document (true bill)"; in Khwārazmian čk means *jarīda*, *daftar-i nivīsanda*, cf. Benzing 1968, 7, and in New Persian čak means *money order*, *written order*, *deed*, French *chèque*, English *cheque*, Arabic *šakk*, *written document*.

26 West 1892, 10 n. 5, read *hōsukūngūn*, "auspicious", adding as possibilities *khōskūnīno*, "beneficent", and *anaskikōn-gūn*, "unconfusing". Molé 1963, 63, preferred not to transliterate this word and omitted the end of the passage in his translation. Cereti: ēn mādiyān <ī> xvāš-gōnēn, "questi libri eccelsi".

19.¹⁸ As the Ahunvar, which is the source of the reckoning of the Avesta, is the pattern of the triple division according to the three gāhs of the reckoning of the Avesta, so is the twenty one words' character of the three (gāhs). The character of the twenty-one-fold partition (of the Avesta) indicates its division into three, as it is revealed, saying: "The omniscient Creator shaped from each word a recitation"¹⁹.

20. Sections of the parts, like hāts and fragrads which are in the Nasks, according to knowledge of the witness of the Avesta [i.e., from the teaching of Zoroaster of the venerable *fravahr*], were known to be 1000 in the Iranian lands.

21. But after the devastation that came on from the villain²⁰ Alexander of evil destiny, the creature of Wrath²¹, thereof such was not to be found that could be preserved through the dastwar[s]²².

22. And those [Avesta Nasks] are well known²³ for the establishment of which the blessed Adurbād ī Mahraspandān subjected himself to the ordeal and safely endured it so that the authenticated precepts of the treatises of Erān.šahr be considered genuine exegesis by general consensus.

23. After description of each Nask, namely, about what it speaks principally, each Nask is enumerated, and what is in its various hāts and in fragrads comes to attainment, for whatever is in these chapters²⁴, (this) pleasant-making suitable collection solves any severity²⁵.

24. But, first, here is recorded a written ordinance²⁶ about each Nask and about what it speaks, while the extent of attainment is fashioned not according to their marvellous peculiarities.

18 §§ 19-21 translated in Bailey 1943, 154.

19 Pace Bailey and Cereti. My division into paragraphs is also different here.

20 For this word, cf. Bailey 1963, 80. Macuch 1987, 321: "Schlange".

21 On the concept of xēšm, "wrath", cf. the illuminating article by Pines (Pines 1982, 76), who compared it to Qurānic *hārōn* and Pauline *ōpōn*.

22 On the meaning of the term in the post-Sasanian epoch, when this passage seems to have been composed, cf. Kreyenbroek 1987a. Dhabhar 1932, 3: "the original writing" and Cereti 1997, 100: "[essere considerata come] canone", but dastwar cannot have this meaning here.

23 Pace Macuch 1987, 321.

24 Or: "chapters"; or: "extracts". The Pahlavi word is ambiguous in this context.

25 This word seems to be a *terminus technicus* for "a scriptural difficulty".

26 Cf. Dk 8.1.4, and the note there.

1. namaz t xvarrah t weh, den t mazdesn.

2. S[t]u'dgar madyan abar dz t abezag stayšn t fradom Ohrmazd, gōwīšn pad mentdārīh, guftārīh, kirdārīh, ud pāhrēz, t az dād t wad, tar pīdyāragēni dār, tar²⁷ mardom.

3. stayšn t hunarān ud kirbag t den t weh ud hamgōhr ūš kunīšnīh, ud nīkōnīšn t ahōgān bazag hān wad, tar, den tōhmag azēš škēnīšn az yazīšn t mēnōg ud pāhrēz t gētīg Amaršpand was tēgānīh abar xer t mēnōg.

4. ... (?)²⁸ būd gōwāg dawēd kē andar frašgirdēz sraw.

5. ahīdīh abādīh pahlom hast.

27 Or, pīdyārag ud juddār, tar?
28 West 1892, 11, read here 'kahwanīg' and translated the passage as follows: "It has become old (kahonik), and is witness whose statement extends even unto the renovation of the universe". For me, the word is unreadable.

1. Homage to the glory of the good Religion of Mazda-worship!

2. The S[t]u'dgar contains particulars about the power of the pure glorifying of the first utterance of Ohrmazd, through thinking, speaking, acting.

And about abstaining/defense²⁷ from the law of the evil and the people most causing to adversary. 3. Glorifying the virtues and good deeds of the Good Religion and of like nature, and their effect, and condemning the faults of those of evil religion[s] of all kinds, through whom neglect of the spiritual worship and abstaining from the elements of worldly existence, and also much information about spiritual matters.

4. ... (?) was ... and it will be a speaker whose praise unto the Renovation.

5. 28 Righteousness is perfect excellence.

27 The Pahlavi word has both meanings.
28 The translation of the *manthra* left unchanged here.

Dk 8.3 Warštmānsār Nask; DkM 680.17-681.2; DkS XV.1, 7; DkD 529.7-13; West 1892,

12:

1. Warštmānsār mādiyān abar zāyīšn ī Zardu[x]št ud mādan ī šō Dēn ud cē andar ham dar.
2. ud *mādag²⁹ ī herbadīh ud hawīštīh ud ahūyīh ud radīh ud āstawānīh ī padēš hammiš hangerdīg.tar gōwišn ī Gāθān.
3. abar har ciš wāzag zand ud xvašradagēz ciyōn hān ī gōwēd kū³⁰:
"Warštmānsār kē pad harwisp frāz gōwišnīh frāz dād ēstēd".
4. kū har cē pad Gāθān guft ēstēd, əš pad Warštmānsār ciš apar gōwēd.
5. ahīāyīh ābādīh hast pahlom.

1. The Warštmānsār (Nask) contains particulars about the birth of Zoroaster and his coming into the Religion, and whatever on the same subject.
2. And the essence of priestship and discipleship and lordship (of ahū) and spiritual mastership (of rad) and confession in which the complete summary of the sayings of the Gāθās.
3. Zand on every thing and every word, with a good arrangement, such as one says:
"Warštmānsār is that that has given forth an exposition of everything".
4. That is everything said in the Gāθās, something of it is said in the Warštmānsār.

²⁹ West: *numād*, "notice"; Sanjana: *mād*.

³⁰ Cf. Tavadia 1956, 73.

Dk 8.4 Bag Nask; DkM 681; DkS XV.1, 10; DkD 529.13-21; West 1892, 13:

1. Bag mādiyān abar fradom sax^Vān ī ōšmurišn ī Dēn bazišn ud fradom dām

ī hān sax^Vān ud fradom madan ī hān ud dām passāzišn ud wuzurgih *ī hān
sax^Vān ūš kē hamtan dām ūš nāmcišt mēd³¹ ō gumīzišnīh.

2. hangerdīg.tar dānišn ī abar har ciš jud jud x^Vēš zahag ud cand paywandīh
awiš and paywast ciyōn hān ī Bag rāy guft ēstēd kū: "Bag ī dahmān srūd", kū
ō dahmān guft ēstēd kū kē ēn kirbag kunē āš ēn kirbag kard bawēd.

3. ahlāyīh ābādīh pahlom hast.

³¹ Cf. Dk 9.47.5, where the word appears in Pāzand.

1. The Bag Nask contains particulars about the first word of the the division of the categories of the Avesta²⁹, and the first creature³⁰ of this word, the first coming of it, and the cfashioning of the creature, and the greatness of this word, which is of the same body with the creature³¹ and, particularly, (about) the intermingling of thought with it.

2. The most complete knowledge about everything, each separately its own offspring, and many a linkage (to it) as much connected with it as that how it is said concerning the Bag, namely: "Bag of the community is renown", it is said about the community, meaning that whoever shall do a virtuous deed, a merit will be performed by him.

²⁹ Dēn. Compare the translation in Dk 8.1.4.

³⁰ Ahū, cf. Dk 9.47.4.

³¹ Cf. Dk 9.47.4.

Dk 8.5 Dāmdād Nask; DkM 681.11-20; DkS XV.I, 10; DkD 529.21-530.7; West 1892, 13; Molé 1963, 390-1:

1. Dāmdād mādiyān abar kunīšn ī dādārīh ud dādan ī dām ī pahlom.
2. fradom pad mēnōgīh ud cand cīyōn dāštān ī pad mēnōg waštān ī azāš gēttīg cīhrēnīdag sāxtag ō andar ēbgadīg ko[x]šīšn pattūdan³² ud rāyēnīdan paywastag šāyistan ī ō frajām.
3. ud drang ī ēbgadīh ud ristag ēwēn dām.dahišnīh ūšān stī ud tōhmag ud sraxtag ud cīhr ud kār ud cē andar ham dar.
4. ud cim ō cē dahišnīh ud abdom ō cē rasišnīh.
5. ud abar hān dām.pīyārag ud wizand ud anāgīh azāš ī nišān ud cār ud abzār ī abar wānīdan ud abesihēnīdan ud bōxtan ud abēcīhrēnīdan ī dām azāš.
6. ahlāyīh ābādīh pahlom hast ābādīh.

³² On this and related words, cf. Shaked 1979, 249-250.

- 1.³² The Dāmdād Nask contains particulars about the act of creatorship and the creation of the best creation,
2. first in mēnōg (spiritually) and how it was kept in mēnōg, its change from it into the gēttīg (material), formed and made for the battle against the Assault, its endurance and organization and continual worthiness until the end.
3. And duration of the Assault, the classes and sorts of the creation and their being and seed and parts, nature and task, and on the same subject.
4. And the reason for their creation and their final fate.
5. And about the adversary of that creation, and the harm and evil caused by its mark, and the manner and means of overcoming and destroying it, and saving and freeing creation from it.

³² The translation given here is basically that by MacKenzie 1993b, with slight changes.

Dk 8.6 Nādar Nask; DkM 681.21-682.1; DkS XV.1,11; DkD 530, 7-9; West 1892, 15; Cereti 1997, 102:

1. Nādar³³ Zand ē amāh rāy nē paywast, Abistāg ciyōn pad dastwarīh andar *mādag³⁴ cāšīšn ššmurišn ēzišn dāšt ēstēd.
2. ahlāyīh ābādīh pahlom hast ābādīh.

³³ Cereti: Nāxtar.

³⁴ Y>TWNtk; Cereti: *āmad.

1. The *Zand* of the Nādar Nask has not been handed down to us³³, the Avesta [of it] exists through authority for matters of³⁴ teaching, study and worship.

³³ Cf. zand ē amāh nē paywast, DkM 688.4.

³⁴ Cereti: "[L'Avesta], così come ci è giunto tramite la tradizione religiosa".

Dk 8.7 Pājag Nask, DkM 682.2-684.18; DkS XV.1,11-17; DkD 301.10- *missing folios* 67.13; West 1892, 15-19; Nyberg 1934; Molé 1963, 100-102:

1. Pājag mādiyān abar gōspand dādihā pad ēzišn ī āta(x)šān ābān zōhr Gāhānbār mazdēsnañ ayārīh *rāy kuštan. ēnāz kū mard ō hamkār pad cē hunar ud abzār pad cinišn ud nērang ī ēzišn.

2. ud *ēnāz kū az gōspand srādag bahr āta(x)šān ābān az kadām hannām stanišn ciyōn wīrāyīšn kē pad cē Abistāg frāz barišn.

3. ud cē abar Gāhānbār kū hān dādīg gāh ka kunēd ud ka bē sazihēd, hanjāman ī Gāhānbār ud dāšn ī ō myazd kū ka kunišn tuwān passazāg pad cē paymānīg bē dahišn ka sazišn baxšišn,

kūš sūd nēwagīh ī weh.dahišnān ud mēnōgīhā ud gētīgīhā cē azēš³⁵.

10³⁶. abar wardišn ī gāh rōz māh ud sāl hangām ka namīn zamistān ud sahišn ī az rawišn ī axtarān padēš,

11. kū rasišn ī ahlaw frawahr ō gētīg andar hān 10 rōz ī zamistān frajām sāl sar ciyōnēš hān 5 rōz ī Gāhānīg andar pad hān bawēd

*zamistān³⁷ sazišn hamīh hastišn.

13. ud wēš frēzwānīgīh ī rātīh ud bē dahišnīh andar hān hangām, x^vēškārīh rat ī šahr pad ayārīh ud jādag.gōwīh ī dīrīōšān ud hammoxtan ī, az Frawardīgān rāy, andar Frawardīgān kunišn.

18. ud abar abdīh ud was kirbagīh ī āškārag warzīdārīh ud škeftīh ud grān wināhīh ī ahlamōyīh.

19. ud ēnāz kū ka pad ahlamōyīh kas gumānīg hast pad rōšnkarīh az Yazdān kadām dād andar kadār Yazdān ō ayārīh x^vahišn.

35 The following passages treat similar material, which could be called *halakhic*; it will not interest us here. The previous paragraphs just cited combine treating of matters *halakhic* with the calendar. While §§ 4-9 deal with zōtīg and rāspīg duties, § 10ff. returns more implicitly to treat the calendar.

36 Cf. Nyberg 1934; Boyce 1970, 530.

37 I accept the emendation made in Molé 1963, 101. The text has zlmācīg.

1. The texts of Pājag: about slaughtering cattle in accordance with religious prescription to assist Mazda-worshippers in (their) worship Fires, Waters, libations of the Gāhānbār. This, too, which virtues and skills³⁵ could a man contribute to gather and (what are the) nērang formulas of the worship.

2. And this, too, from which limb the share of the cattle-species is to be taken to Fires, Waters; how it is to be arranged, with what Avesta-(recital) it is to be offered.

3. And whatever is about Gāhānbār, namely, when one celebrates these religious gāhs³⁶, and when it has elapsed, the assembly of Gāhānbār and the offering to the myazd, when it is possible to perform it properly, in what proportion must be given out, when it must be prepared and distributed, and what profit and advantage will be therefrom to the good creation, in both mēnōg and gētīg.

10. About the rotation of the gāh, the days, the months, and the years, the season when there is summer (and/or) winter, and the appearances therein due to the motion of the constellations.

11. That is, the arrival of the Righteous *Fravashis* into the gētīg world during these 10 days at the end of the winter, the beginning/the end of the year; as these 5 gāh-days are for that purpose: the passing away of the winter, the becoming of the summer³⁷.

13. And fulfilling more duties of generosity and distribution in this season (of the festival), the proper function of the *ratu* of the province to assist the poor and to advocate them, to teach (them), for the sake of Frawardīgān, how to perform properly the (festival of) Frawardīgān.

18. And about the admirability and great meritoriousness of public observances, and (about) distress and severe sinfulness of heresy.

19. And this, too, when a man is doubtful, through heresy, what is the law of God as the elucidation (is concerned); which God is to entreated for assistance.

35 abzār², cf. MacKenzie 1971, 4.

36 New Persian gāh, gāh, "throne, place, -time", in the last sense from Avestan gāθā, "hymn, the time set aside for the recitation of a particular gāθā, then simply time", de Blois 1993b, 61.

37 The interest in the calendar returns a few paragraphs later; it seems, that the material in-between was mostly Sasanian interpolations of a later date.

Dk 8.8 Ratō.dāt.aētag Nask, DkM 684.19-685.9; DkS XV.1, 17-18; DkD *missing folios* 67.13-68.14; West 1892, 19-20:

1. Ratō.dāt.aētag mādiyān *abar dēnīg ud frēzwānīg kunīšnīg ēwēn ud dad.
2. cīm ī sazāgīh ud sazāgtarīh pad rad.pēšag-sālār, abārīg patīh
xVadāyaz bahr xVēšīh, kū cīyōn be wīzārīšn sazāgīh az
asazāgīh ud sazāgtarīh az [a]sazāgīh padaš, kū pad radīh ī xVānīrah ud
abārīg kišwar ī jud jud fradom kē be ēštād az
mazdēšnān.
3. abar nīmāyīšn ud āgāhīnīšn ī nīšāst ud brahmag ī Amahraspandān, nērang
ud abzar ī andar ēzīšn ī Yazdān, gāh ī xVēškārīh ī zōtān rāspīgān andar
ēzīšn ē[w], ud hamāgēz xVēškārīh sardārān pad kār tīšn jud jud ō bun.
4. ud meht ī wīzīdar.dahīšnīh andar kīrbagān ud ēwēnag ī wīzīdar
dahīšnīh ud nazdīgīh ī Ohrmazd ō menīšn, gōwīšn, kunīšn ī axV ī astōmand.
5. ābādīh ahlāyīh pahlom hast.

1. The Ratō.dāt.aētag book (is on) the custom and law of religious and obligatory actions³⁸.
2. The reason of the worthiness and superiority in leader of the *rad*-priestly guild, and his possession of portion[s] of other authority, even of the lordship; it is, how worthiness should be *discriminated from unworthiness in him*, and superiority from unworthiness, it is, in *rad*-office of xVānīrah and other continents, each separately, the first which stood from the Mazda-worshippers.
3. About the demonstration and acknowledgement of the sitting and the (ritual) manner of the Bountiful Immortals, the nērang ritual instruments in the worship of the Yazdān, the place of duty of the Zōt- and rāspīg- priests in the worship, and also all the duties of the leaders in their work, each separately, according to the source³⁹.
4. And the greatness of the discriminative reflection in meritorious deeds and the kinds of the the discriminative reflection, and the closeness of Ohrmazd to the thinking, speaking and acting of the corporeal existence.

³⁸ Cf. MacKenzie 1970, 269.

³⁹ The translation of the words ō bun is purely tentative. West 1892, 20: "originally" or [n. 3] "fundamentally". Was some written (Avestan?) text meant, according to which the worship was performed?

Dk 8.9 Barīš Nask, DkM 685.9-687.5, Dks XV.1, 18-21; DkD 68.14-71.12; West 1892, 20-23:

1. Barīš³⁸ mādiyān abar zōr ī rāyēnīšnīh rāstīh rādīh ī āsn srūd xrad was hunarān.
2. ud hānēz ī drōzanīh ud pūš³⁹ ud a.dānīh duš.āgāhīh ud was ahōgān ī hunarān hamēstār *brādarēnīd.
3. ud hān ī Wahman ud Spendarmad ud Srōš ud Ahlīšwang was Yazdān ud hān ī Akōman ud Waran ud Xēšm ud An.ahī ud was dēwān hān ī āfarēn ud nēfrēn huyābagīh ud duš.yābagīh ī hunērangīh ud duš.nērangīh ud husaxvānīh ud duš.saxvānīh ud cē andar ham dar.
4. ud hān zamān baxt ud gōhr ud kāmāg ud dēn ud hōg⁴⁰ ud trahangud x^vēškārīh ud tuxšāgīh ud cē andar ham dar ud andar hān x^vadāyīh ud rāyēnīdārīh ud dastwarīh ud dādwarīh ud miyāncīgīh.
5. ud hān ī kaš āstīh ud mīhr.dārīh ud cē abar ham dar.
6. ud hān ī dād ud ēwēn, kīrbag, wināh ud husrawīh ud duš.srawīh ahlēyīh ud druwandīh ud cē abar ham dar.
- 7.⁴¹ ud hān ī šarm škōy sam ud srōšīgīh ud cē andar ham dar.
8. ud hān ī paywand ī pad x^vēšīh ērmenīšnīh ud arwandīh ud dēn ud cē abar ham dar.
9. ud hān ī sazišnīgīh ud a.sazišnīgīh ud *dōstīh ud dušmenīh ud cē abar ham dar.

38 Brēh is an alternative reading.

39 de Menasce 1958b, 38: panīh, "l'avarice".

40 New Persian xōy.

41 Cf. Tafazzoli 1974a, 112-3.

1. Barīš contains particulars about many virtues of the directing power⁴⁰, the truth, the liberality of the inborn and learned wisdom⁴¹.
2. And what concerns the evil knowledge of falsity, misery⁴² and ignorance and many faults that are fraternized⁴³ with the opposite of virtues.
3. What concerns the (respective) benedictions and maledictions, benevolence and malevolence, good spell and bad spells, beneloquence and maleloquence of (respectively) Wahman and Spendarmad, Srōš and Ahlīšwang⁴⁴ and many divinities (on the one hand) and of Akōman and Waran, Xēšm and An.ahī⁴⁵ and many demons (on the other), and whatever is on the same subject.
4. And what concerns Time, Destiny, substance, will, religion, manners, culture, duty, effort, and whatever is on the same subject; and amand these: royalty, government, authority, judgeship and mediatorship⁴⁶.
5. And what concerns when there is peace and keeping of covenant, and whatever is on the same subject.
6. And what concerns the law and the custom, merit and sin, good fame and bad fame, righteousness and wickedness, and whatever is on the same subject.
7. What concerns pudency, *awe, fear and obedience⁴⁷, and whatever is on the same subject.
8. What concerns connections through property, subordination, droitness, religion, and whatever is on the same subject.
9. What concerns suitability and unsuitability, friendship and enmity, and whatever is on the same subject.

40 de Menasce 1958b, 38: "le fonctionnement ou gouvernement des facultés (zōr rāyēnīšnīh)".

41 On "inborn and learned wisdom", cf. Shaked 1987b, 31f.

42 As to the translation, cf. West 1892, 21 n. 1. The word means the notion opposite to rādīh. Compare:

1) zōr ī rāyēnīšnīh 1) ?

2) rāstīh 2) drōzanīh

3) rādīh 3) pūš

4) āsn srūd xrad 4) duš.āgāhīh

5) was hunarān 5) was ahōgān ī hunarān hamēstār.

43 de Menasce 1958b, 38: "et les faux frères (brātarēt) [des vertus]".

44 Ardawahišt.

45 The opposite to Ahlīšwang. de Menasce 1958b, 38, read here "Indar".

46 On this word and its concept, cf. Shaked 1980.

47 Cf. Tafazzoli 1974a, 112-3, škōy sam/sahm "fear", quoting EpMan II, ii, 3, 611.3.

10. ud hān ī hucihrīh ud dušcihrīh ud juwānīh ud zarmānīh ud tuwānagīh ud škōhīh ud farraxvīh ud duš.farraxvīh ud cē abar ham dar.

11. ud hān ī ōz ī andar tōhmagān sardāgān cišān ud cē abar ham dar.

12. ud hān ī frazānagīh ud frašn.wizārīh ud purr.nēwagīh ud cē abar ham dar.

13. ud hān ī suy ud tišn ud azēš darmānīh ud cē abar ham dar.

14. ud hān ī frasāwandīh ud margīh ud sazišnīgīh ud cē abar ham dar.

15. ud hān ī hammistīh ciš rōnīh ud pēšīh ud pasīh ud cē abar ham dar.

16. ud hān ī padīrišnīgīh ud a.padīrišnīgīh ud rāmēnīdārīh ud bēšēzēnīdārīh ud cē abar ham dar.

17. ud hān ī tagīgīh ud uzwānīgīh ud hanjumanīgīh ud cē abar ham dar.

18. ud hān ī ōš menišnīh hān ī tan ud ruwān ud hān ī wahišt ud dušaxv ud tan ī pasēn ud cē abar ham dar.

19. ud hān ī harwisp āgāhīh ī dādār ī Ohrmazd hamāg wehīh ī Amahraspandān ud xvarrah ī Mard ī Ahlaw ud cē abar ham dar.

20. ud abarīg was dādār ārastārīh suxvan rāyēnīdārīh ud xvadayīh nēw.ardārīh ud tan dāštārīh ud ruwān buxtārīh azēš passazag ō hān ī gōwēd kū ard.suxvan hast gōwišnīh Barīš Kaškīsrāw Wišāsp.Sāst.

21. ābādīh ahišyīh hast pahlom.

10. What concerns good breeding and bad breeding⁴⁸, youth and old age, richness and poverty, fortune and misfortune, and whatever is on the same subject.

11. What concerns vigor which is in races, species, things, and whatever is on the same subject.

12. What concerns study and solving of problems/questions, complete braveness, and whatever is on the same subject.

13. What concerns hunger, thirst and their remedy, and whatever is on the same subject.

14. What concerns transcendence, death, mortality, and whatever is on the same subject.

15. What concerns totality, direction of things, precedence and sequence, and whatever is on the same subject.

16. What concerns acceptability and unacceptability, and the disposition to cause pleasure and to cause harm, and whatever is on the same subject.

17. What concerns valiance and loquacity and sociability, and whatever is on the same subject.

18. What concerns the intellect (and the) mind, the body and the soul, Paradise and Hell and the Body to Come, and whatever is on the same subject.

19. And the omniscience of the Creator Ohrmazd, the whole goodness of the Bountiful Immortals and the glory of the Righteous Man, and whatever is on the same subject.

20. And many other statements about the disposition of the Creator, organization and rulership, marshalcy and maintenance of the body and salvation of the soul, suitable to what one sasys:

"Word of Truth is (this) discours, Barīš, Kaškīsrāw, Wišāsp.Sāst".

48 Or: "beauty and ugliness".

Dk 8.10 Kaškīsrāw Nask; DkM 687.6-12; DkS XV.1, 21ff.; DkD 71.12-72.6; West 1892,

23:

1. Kaškīsrāw mādiyān abar nigēz ī Yazdān yazīšn nērang pad cē waštān ī dēw.yazīšn pādyābīh ud a.pādyābīh āgāhīh.

2. wurōyišn ud pahrez ī Yaštān daxšag ud nišān ī abar rēzišnīh ud anāgīh az dēwān ō zamānag zamānag ud abarīg ī.šān hanjābišn frajām pērōzīh ī Yazdān.

3. ēwēn abzāyēnag srōd *hammōg⁴² ī Ōhrmazd ō Zardu(x)št xVānīhēd mēnōgān sās̄t.

4. ābādīh pahlom ahlāyīh hast.

⁴² hamag.

1. Kaškīsrāw contains particulars about the exposition of divine worship and ritual, through what one can deteriorate the daēva-worship⁴⁹ and knowledge about the ritual ablutions and about absence of these.

2. The faith and the tending for the Yašt ritual; signs and tokens of overflowing and wickedness through demons at different times, and about the ultimate destruction of others of that (demoniac) kind and the final victory of gods.

3. Sorts of sublime chants, teaching of Ōhrmazd to Zoroaster, called spiritual sās̄ts (doctrines).

⁴⁹ Or: "through what the proper worship could be turned into the daēva-worship and how to avoid that".

Dk 8.11 Wištāsp Sāst, DkM 687.13-688.3; Dks XV.1, 21ff.; DkD *missing folios* 72.6-73.8; West 1892, 23-5; Molé 1963, 348-9; Williams 1990, II, 213-4:

1. Wištāsp Sāst abar hammōg⁴³ ī ō Kay Wištāsp mādiyan hān ī ō xVadāyTh xēm ud cīhr ud barišn ud dānišn frahang ud dād rāyēnidārTh ī dāmān ud kāmāg.rawāgTh ī Yazdān padēš abāyīšnīg.
2. ud abar frēstīdan ī dādār Ohrmazd Amahrspandān ō Kay Wištāsp pad gugāyīh ī abar Ohrmazd.aštagīh⁴⁴ ī Spitāmān Zardu(x)št, abēzag wehīh ī Dēn ī Mazdēsn, framān ī dahyupat Wištāsp pad pērōzTh pad padīraftan ī Dēn az Zardu(x)št.
3. wēnābdāg madan ī Amahrspandān ō dar ud did ō mān handēmānTh ī Wištāsp šāh ūš ham niyastān ud parastagān⁴⁵, wizārdan ī ō Wištāsp Ohrmazd paygām ud padīraftan ī rāmšāh⁴⁶ Wištāsp Dēn ī Mazdēsn.
4. sārēnīdān ī xēsm dēw Arjāsp ī Hyōn ō kō[x]šīšn ī Wištāsp ud petyārdārīh ī Zardu(x)št; ārayīšn rawīšn ī Wištāsp šāh ō hān kō[x]šīšn ud cē andar ham dar.
5. ābādTh pahlom hast ahlāyTh.

Dk 8.12 Waštag⁴⁷ Nask; DkM 688.4-5; Dks XV.1, 11; DkD *missing folios* 73.8-10; West 1892, 25⁴⁸; Cereti 1997, 104:

1. Waštag Abistāg ud Zand pad dastwar⁴⁹ ō amān nē paywast.
2. ābādTh hast pahlom ahlāyTh.

43 Williams 1990, II, 213, read *hamāg, translating: "all [the particulars]"; Cereti 1997, 104 (after Molé 1963, 349: āmok), rendered it more correctly: "insegnamenti".

44 Williams 1990, II, 213: ud ayšdagTh ī., "[and (as a) reminder to Spitaman Zoroaster]".

45 I follow here Molé. Williams: ūš ham-nīstān *frēstagān wizārdan, "his ministers. The envoys' explanation ...".

46 I follow Molé's reading. Williams has rāmThā, "peaceful [acceptance]".

47 Dād in Bahman Punjya's Rivāyat, Hašt/Xašt/Xušt in other Rivāyats, cf. Dhabhar 1932, 2.

48 Cf. also West 1892, 25 n. 1.

49 Cereti: pad *dastwarīh.

1. The Wištāsp Sāst is about teachings to Kay Wištāsp, especially, the temper, nature, behavior, knowledge, education and law needed for rulership; the government of the creatures and the propagation of the will of the gods required for it.
2. And about the sending Immortal Bountiful Ones by Ohrmazd the Creator to Kay Wištāsp as testimony of Ohrmazd's mission of Zoroaster, of the pure goodness of the Mazda-worshipping Religion, (and their) announcement (framān) of victory to Wištāsp the ruler of countries through (his) accepting the Religion from Zoroaster.
3. The coming of the Immortal Bountiful Ones in a visible form to the court, and then (did), to the residence, their audience with the king Wištāsp and his companions and servants; their (Immortal Bountiful Ones') explanation of Ohrmazd's message to Wištāsp, and the acceptance of the Mazda-worshipping Religion by Wištāsp, the king of peace⁵⁰.
4. How the demon of Wrath provoked Arjāsp the Hyōnite to wage a war with Wištāsp and opposition to Zoroaster; preparations and movements by the king Wištāsp to that war, and whatever is on the same subject.

1. The Waštag [Nask], in its Avestan or Pahlavi form, was not transmitted to us by [any] *dastur*⁵¹.

50 The expression is unknown to me otherwise; West: "the obedient king". It must be a translation of the Avestan *rapavant-*, used of Vištāspa- in Y 34.4, 7; *rap-* is routinely rendered by *rām-*.

51 Cereti: "nella tradizione religiosa".

Dk B.13. Cihrdād Nask; DkM 688.6-690.11; DkS XV.1, 25ff.; DkD *missing folios* 73.10-78.3; West 1892, 25-31; Mole 1963 279-91:

1. Cihrdād mādīgān abar tōhmag ī mardomān cīyōn brēhēnīdan ī Ōhrmazd Gayōmard fradom mard ō paydāgīhast ī kerbtī ud cē ēwēnag būdan ī fradom juxtag Mašī ud Mašānī.
2. ud abar zahag paywand ī awēšān tā purr rawīšnīgīh ī mardom andar miyānag ī Xʷanīrah ī kišwar ud baxšīšn ī awēšān pad *6 kišwar ī pēramōn ī Xʷanīrah.
3. tōhmag tōhmag ī nāmcištīg ōsmurīd pad astag frīstīšnīg framān ī Dādwar ō jud jud tōhmag īš ō gyāg kū šud framūd handāxtan zēwīšn.
4. ud Xʷarrah az anōh bāxt ēstād; ūšān wihez ō kišwar kišwar ud hānaz ī ō kōstīgīhā ī Xʷanīrah ud hān īšān pad miyānag gyāg mānišn būdan; xīr.wizārdagīh ēwag ēwag sraxtag ī mardom ī andar bun tōhmag dād ēstād.
5. bun.nīhišn ī dād ud ēwēnag; hān ī dahigānīh pad warzīdārīh ud frawardārīh ī gēhan abar Waykərat ī pēšdād, hān ī dahībedīh pad pānagīh ud rāyēnīdārīh ī dām, abar Hušang ī Pēšdād tōhmag.
6. sraw ī Hušang ī fradom ud Tahmōrup ī didīgar azāš haft kišwar Xʷadāy ud tōhmag sraw ōsmurīšnīh az bundahišn tā Yim.
7. hān ī Yim sidīgar azāš haft kišwar Xʷadāy tōhmag sraw āgāhīh ī īš zamānag, sazišn ī az bundahišn tā Xʷadāyīh ī Yim frajām.
8. ud hān ī haft kišwar dušāgāh duš.Xʷadāy Dahāg sraw paywand īš abāz ō Tōz⁵⁰ ī Hušang brād ud tazīgān pid, ud āgāhīh awē azāš zamānag sazišn zamānag ī az hu.Xʷadāyīh [ī] Yim frajām ī tā duš.Xʷadāyīh frajām ī Dahāg paywand ī az Yim tā Frēdōn.
9. hān ī Xʷanīrah Xʷadāy Frēdōn ī sraw pad wānīdan ī Dahāg zadan ī Māzandarān deh ud baxtan ī Xʷanīrah pad Salm ud Tōz ud Eric īš 3 pus; paywastan īšān pad duxt ī Pātsraw ī tazīgān šāh.

50 *Az / Taz

- 1.⁵² Cihrdād: particulars about families of Mankind: how Ōhrmazd created Gayōmard, the First Man, in visible form, and of what kind the first couple, Mašī and Mašānī, were.
2. And about their offspring until the filling of the middle (of the earth), the Continent Xʷanīrah, by men and their distribution over the six continents surrounding Xʷanīrah.
3. Each race being specifically accounted for, by the order of the Creator sending messengers to each separate race, allotting them to the places where they had gone, to live there.
4. And (how) the glory was distributed from there (Xʷanīrah?); and their migration to the different continents and to the regions of Xʷanīrah, and those who dwelt in the middle; an explanation of the nature of the individual parts of man, as they were created in the primal race.
5. The establishment of the Law and of customs: that of farming, for the tilling and fostering of the world, (laid) on Waykərat the "first-appointed" pēšdād, and that of ruling, for the protection and organization of the creation, on the family of Hušang the "first-appointed".
6. An account of Hušang the first and Tahmōrup the second ruler of the seven continents, and an account of (their) family from the primal creation until Yim.
7. And of the family of Yim, the third ruler of the seven continents, and knowledge about his time, and about the passing of time from the primal creation until the end of the reign of Yim.
8. An account of the ignorant, evil ruler of the seven continents Dahāg and his ancestors from Tōz, the brother of Hušang, the (fore)father of the Arabs, and information about him and his period, and about the passage of time from the end of the good reign of Yim until the end of the reign of Dahāg, and the lineage of Yim until Frēdōn.
9. An account of the conquest of Dahāg by Frēdōn, ruler of Xʷanīrah, of his smiting the province of Māzandarān and his division of Xʷanīrah between his three sons Salm and Tōz and Eric; their uniting with the daughters of Pātsraw, king of the Arabs.

52 The translation adopted here is basically that by MacKenzie 1991, 560-1, with slight emendations.

10. Tōz paywand ud paywand sraw ī awēšān jud jud; hān ī Mānūščihr ī Erān XʷadāyTh, EriJ nāf.
11. hān ī Tōzōmand Frāsiyāb ī Tūrān dahibed; ud Tuhmāsp Uzaw ī Erān dahibed; Mānūščihr nāf.
12. Kay Kawād ī kayān xāg ud Erān Xʷadāy ud Tōzōmand Xʷadāy Karsāsp.
13. ud Kay Us ī Kawād pad haft kišwar Xʷadāy ud kaydān.
14. ud Kay Husraw ī Siyāwaxš pus XʷwanTrah Xʷadāy.
15. ud was mādagān ī tōhmag nāmcištig sraw ī Erān, Tūrān Salmān tāyēz Xʷadāy Kay Lōhrāsb ud dahibed Kay Wištāsp.
16. Dēn ī Mazdesn wāxšwar Spitāmān Zardu[x]št ud sazišn ī zamānag ī az fradom XʷadāyTh [I] Frēdōn tā madan ī Zardu[x]št ō hampursTh.
17. ud was tōhmag ud sraw ī az hān frāz andar ham Nask pad būd ōšmurd ēstēd ūš ō būd wīnārThast ciyōn Sasānagān īšān pad huāfrīd huōšmurd ūšān XʷadāyTh.
18. ud andar Mānūšcuhr, Nōdar, *Yōšt ī Fryān ud andar Spandyādān tōhmag *Avarāθrabā* pid Adurbād ī Mahraspandān.
19. ud hastTh ī ēgāz pad bawēdTh ēstēd, cē hūnar ud XʷarrTh was ciyōnTh XʷadāyThēz ī Frašgird rawišnig ō tōhmagān baxt ud pasēz ī ō tōhmag rēzThēd ūš tā Frašgird āwarēd.
20. abar bun dahišn⁵¹ ī pešag ud kirrōgTh, XʷēškārTh ī āwām; was āgāhTh ī mardom pad spōxtan ī wizand ī petyārag ud dārišn ī tan ud bōzišn ī ruwān rāyēnīdārTh ī gehān abāyišnig pešēz az mādan ī Zardu[x]št pad Dādār framān az Yazdān wāxš burdārTh ud wisp ō pešānpāyān ī zamānag zamānag mādan cē andar ham darThā.
21. pañlom ahiāyTh ābadTh hast.

51 For the reading, cf. Molé 1963, 280.

10. The lineage of Tōz and an account of the lineage of these separately; of Mānūščihr, ruler of Erān, of the family of EriJ.
11. Of Frāsiyāb the Tōzian, ruler of Tūrān; Uzaw, son of Tumāsp, ruler of Erān, of the family of Manuščihr.
12. Kay Kawād ancestor of the Kayānids, ruler of Erān, and the Tōzian lord Karsāsp;
13. Kay Us, (of the family) of Kawād, ruler of the Seven Continents and mainainer of kavi-dom.
14. Kay Husraw, son of Siyāwaxš, ruler of XʷanTrah.
15. And several chapters on families, specifically an account of Erān, Tūrān, and Salmān until the lord Kay Luhrāsp and the ruler Kay Wištāsp.
16. The prophet of the Mazdaysnian religion, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št, and the passing of time from the beginning of the reign of Frēdōn until the coming of Zardu[x]št to the consultation (with Ohrmazd).
- 17.⁵³ And many families and sayings there are further mentioned in the same Nask, who count as having existed or whose being has been arranged (for the future), such as the Sasanians, who are blessed and remembered for good⁵⁴ and their rule.
18. In the family of Manuščihr, Nōdar, *Yōšt (descendant of) Fryān; and in the family of Spandyād, Avarāθrabā, (fore)father of Adurbād, son of Mahraspand.
19. And there are those which then too will come to existence, for the many kinds of virtue and glory, and the rulership connected with the Restoration, have been distributed among (different) families and will later flow to (each) family, and bring it to the Restoration.
20. About the primal creation of crafts, arts, and the proper functions of the ages; the several kinds of knowledge of mankind for warding off the harm arising from the Adversary and for preserving the body and saving the soul, necessary for arranging the world, came - "even before the coming of Zardu[x]št" - at the command of the Creator through the transmission of the word by the gods to the leaders of the different times; and more on the same subject.

53 West 1892, 30 n. 3, noted that §§17-19 were composed during later period of the Sasanian rule.

54 Compare Hebrew (Esther) zāqūr laʔōb and Aramaic (inscriptions from the Arsacid period from Palmyra, Hatra, Assur etc.) dəqīr laʔāb.

Dk 8.14, Spand Nask, DkM 690.12-692.14; DkS XV.1, 28-32; DkD *missing folios* 78.2-82.3; West 1892, 31-34; Molé 1963, 276-8:

1. Spand mādiyān abar bawīšn ud hambawīšnīh ī Zardu[x]št *stī⁵² ud frawahr ud x^varrah cīyōn āfrīdagth⁵³ | ēwag ēwag pad mēnōg ud cē ēwēnag dād ō gētīg, cīyōn paywastan ī ō zāyīdārān, madan ī zāyīdārān āgenēn, hambawīhistan ī andar mādar ud zāyīšn ī az mād ud cē andar ham dar.
2. ud abarēz rasišn ī har dō mēnōg, hān ī weh pad waxšēntān ud hān ī wattar pad marnjēntān, pērozgarīh ī hān weh mēnōg ud parwarīšn ī Zardu[x]št.
3. rasišn ī ō purnāyīh pad 30 sālag ō ham.pursagīh ī Ōhrmazd madan ud būdan ī 7 ham.pursagīh andar 10 sāl.
4. was abdtīh ī azēš padēš paydāgthast cīyōn hast ī ham.paywast wizīdag ud az Dēnkard niwēg nišānēntīd.
5. 7 brīn cīyōn Spand x^vānThēd 7 frašn hār jar ē frašn, baxšīšn ī abārīg Naskīha pad ēd 7 frašn pad frāz.gōwīšnīh ī andar ēwag ēwag gyāg ī hum.pursagīh.
6. abar frašn frašn hangām ī nišast ud xāst ī har jār ud ēwēnag ī nišastan ī Amahrspāndān, frāz madan ī Zardu[x]št ō hān handēmānīh ud gāh īš hān gyāg ud abar hān ī awīš guftan ud cē hān ī awīš nīmōdan.
7. ud frāz burdan ī abar Zardu[x]št xrad ī harwisp.āgāhīh ud dīd Zardu[x]št, pad hān xrad *būd, būd *ud bawēd hamē, candaš drang ī padēš ī hān xrad

52 Bailey 1943, 30: gētīg.

53 Or: (*āfrīdan).

1. The texts of Spand: about the becoming and conception⁵⁵ of the existence⁵⁶ of Zoroaster's *sfravahr* and *x^varrah*, how each one of them was created in mēnōg and in which manner (it was) put⁵⁷ into gētīg, how (they, i.e., *sfravahr* and *x^varrah*) attached themselves to (Zoroaster's) parents, (about) the parents came together, (Zoroaster's) having been conceived⁵⁸ in the mother⁵⁹, (his) birth from the mother, and on the same subject.
2. And about the arrival of both spirits, the Good Spirit to assure growth⁶⁰, and the Worse Spirit to mortify (Zoroaster), and the victoriousness of the Good Spirit, and the nourishment of Zoroaster.
3. His arrival to maturity at the age of 30, (his) coming to a conference with Ōhrmazd, and occurrence of 7 conferences within 10 years.
4. Many marvels were revealed by him (Zoroaster) through it (the conferences), such as there are these, assembled together and selected, mentioned in the Dēnkard-scripture.
5. 7 sections called Spand (contain) 7 questions, a question at each occasion, and the bestowal of other Nasks through these 7 questions, through speaking out of each place of the conference.
6. About the time of sitting down and rising up at the occasion of each question, and the manner of the sitting of the Bountiful Immortals, (about the manner of) Zoroaster's coming forth into their presence, his position in every place, and about what was said and shown to him.
7. And about Zoroaster's consuming of the wisdom of Complete Knowledge and (about how) Zoroaster, being within this wisdom, saw what there was and there once will be, how long (Zoroaster) was within it, i.e., (in) this wisdom.

55 So Bailey 1943, 30; Molé 1963, 277: "la préparation (à l'existence); MacKenzie 1971, 40: hambūdan, hambaw-, "be united, composed". It is not impossible that the word in question is a distortion of hambūsišn, "conception", for which cf. MacKenzie, *ibid.* Cereti 1997, 105: "coezistenza".

56 On the problems of stī, 1. "existence, being"; 2. "person, being", cf. Shaked 1971, 89-97.

57 Or: "/given/created (*dādan)", which is also the reading in Cereti, *ibid.*

58 Cf. note 1.

59 Or, probably, "womb"; compare mād few words later.

60 It can be rendered also "to rear as a prophet" etc.

8. cē hān īš pas andar bē mānd abaz uzward ciyōn hazēš abardom ud pahlom ī gyāgān wahišt, gāh ī mīzd ī TEXTān, pādag pādag ciyōnāšān arjānīgīh ī pad kirbag warzīdārīh, ud nigūndom ud wattom ī gyāgān došax^v, gyāg ī pātīfrās ī druwandān ciyōnāšān wināh, ud miyānag ī har 2 hamēstāgān, gyāg ī hāwandān ī kirbag wināh; ud Cinwad puhī kē padaš amar ī pad kirbag wināh, ud tan ī pasēn kē pad passāzišn ī har TEXT ud druwand ud boxtišn ī wispdahišnān az hamāg anāgīh bawēd.

9. anyaz was ciš ī abd ud sax^van ī ēd 7 frašn hangirdīg ē ī az har ēwēnag dānišn āgāhīh.

10. abaraz paywastan ī Zardu(x)št āgāhīh ī Dēn ī Mazdēsn ō gēhān hāxtan īš mardom ō Dēn, āwāmān ī pas az Zardu(x)št tā Frašgird.

11. abar ciyōnīh rāyēnišnīh ī zamānag *ī mardom, brīn ī satōzim ud hazangrō[k]zim, nišān ud abdih ud škift ī abar frajām ī har hazangrō[k]zim andar gēhān paydāgīhēd.

12. padaz zāyišn ud rasišn ī Hōšēdar ī Zardu(x)št pus pad frajām ī fradom hazangrō[k]zim ud sraw ī *awē ūš zamānag, was wišuftārān ud ārastārān ī zamānag ī miyānag ī hazangrō[k]zim ī Zardu(x)štān ud madan ī Hōšēdar.

13. ud rasišn ī Hōšēdar.Māh ī Zardu(x)št pus pad frajām ī didtgar hazangrō[k]zim ud āgāhīh ī awē ūš zamānag, wišuftārān ud ārastārān ī andarg ī hazangrō[k]zim ī Hōšēdarān.

14. madan ud rasišn ī Sō[k]šyāns ī Zardu(x)št pus pad frajām ī sidtgar hazangrō[k]zim; wišuftārān ud ārastārān ī andarg ī hazangrō[k]zim ī Hōšēdar.Māhān, rasišn ī Sō[k]šyāns, āgāhīh ī Sō[k]šyāns ūš zamānag.

15. padaz Frašgird tan ī pasēn andar hān ī awē zamānag bawēd paydāg.

16. pahlom ābādīh ahlāyīh hast.

8. That after he stayed in it (in the wisdom), he understood that paradise is the most exalted and best of places, the reward-throne of the righteous ones, grades of position according to their worthiness through performance of good deeds, and the basest and worst of places, Hell, place of punishment of the wicked ones, according to their sin, and between the two, Limbo (hamēstāgān), the place of those whose virtues and sins are equal; and the Bridge of Separation, at which there will be the account of virtues and sins, and the Body to Come in which (there will be) the test of all the righteous and the wicked and (there will be) the salvation of those who belong to the good creation of every evil.

9. Also information (about) other many marvellous things and the summary of the words of these 7 questions which is the complete wisdom of every kind.

10. Also about attachment of the Mazda-worshipping Revelation to the world by Zoroaster, his conversion of people into the Religion, the ages after Zoroaster until the Renovation.

11. About how the people of the time must be governed, divisions of centuries and millenia, about signs, wonders and miracles which are to be made manifest in the world at the end of each millenium.

12. Among these also the birth and the arrival of Hōšēdar son of Zoroaster at the end of the first millenium and the account⁶¹ on him and his time; (about) disturbers⁶² and restorers⁶³ during the millenium of Hōšēdar.

14. The coming and the arrival of the Savior son of Zoroaster at the end of the third millenium; (about) disturbers and restorers during the millenium of Hōšēdar.Māh, the arrival of the Saviors, the knowledge about the Saviors and his time.

15. About the Renovation and the Future Body: they will be revealed in his time.

61 In this context, probably, "glory", if one translates sraw etymologically.

62 Or, "causers of mutiny".

63 Note that the Pahlavi (etc.) wyr²st-/r²st- is semantically identical with Western Semitic (Aramaic, Syriac, Hebrew) TQK/TKN, "to repaire, to arrange, to compose", etc.

Dk 8.15 Bagān Yašt; DkM 692.15-693.2; DkS XV.1, 33; DkD *missing folios* 82.3-4; West 1892, 34-35:

1. Bagān Yašt⁵⁴ mādiyān fradom abar Ohrmazd yaštan Bagān ī abardom, ud did abārīg a.paydāg ud paydāg stīhan⁵⁵ az Yazdān yaštan kēšān rōzān⁵⁶ frāz nām; ōz x^varrah amāwandīh ud pērōzgarīh abdih ī awēšān.
2. hānēz was Yazdān ī andar hān ī awēšān yašt nām guft hēnd ūšān pāhrēz niyāyīšn.
3. ud arzānīgīh āyāft dādārīh ī ō yaštārān, x^vēškārīh īšān jud jud was ōšmurišn ī andar Yazdān.
4. x^vēškārīh ī dānišn āgāhīh ī a.wimand ī abar xērān rāyēnišnān ī āwām az Dādār ī Ohrmazd awēšān abar gumārd ud x^vēškārēnīdan ēstēnd.
5. pahlom ābādīh ahlāyīh hast.

54 Cereti 1997, 105: Bayān Yasr.

55 Skjærvø 1989c: gētiḡān.

56 Cereti, *ibid.*, has different readings.

1. The texts of "Worship of the Gods" (Bagān Yašt): first, about the worship of Ohrmazd, the highest of the Gods⁶⁴, and second, (about) the worship of other Divinities of invisible and visible entities⁶⁵, Whose names (are invoked) on (respective) days; (about) their strength, glory, might, victoriousness and marvellousness.
2. This, too, (about) many Gods Whose names are invoked in Their (respective) worship⁶⁶, and Their prayers for protection.
3. And the worthiness (of the prayers and) the granting of boon[s] to the worshippers, their proper functions of many separate recitations unto the Gods.
4. (About) the unlimited duty of acquaintance the knowledge about the arrangements of the matters of the age, over which the Creator Ohrmazd appointed them and they (must) keep on causing to perform the proper functions.

64 The ancient "pagan" and Old-Persian word is used, at odds with "Divinities", Yazdān, a few words later, which seems to be a Zoroastrianized gloss. Cf. the remarks of Molé (Molé 1963, 65 n. 14 & 66).

65 On this word, cf. p. 37 n. 53; Shaked 1971, 89-97.

66 Or, Yašts.

Dk 8.29 Nērangestān Nask; DkM 735.6-737.5; DkS XVI, 18-21; DkD 559.14-561.5; West 1892, 94-97; partly edited and translated or referred to in Bailey 1933-5b, 277; Widengren 1967a; the text was fully edited and translated in Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995, 19-23; after consulting this work, I included several improvements into my manuscript; the chaptering as given here is, however, that by West.

1. brīnag ē Nērangestān mādigān abar nērang ī ēzišn ī Yazdān, hān ī frēzbānīg ī ō puhl šawēd, abzōnīg kirbagīh ī az weš marīh ī rāspīgān andar ēzišn ud Abistāg ī zōt ud rāspīg har 2 ōh gōwišn, hān ī ēwag ōh gōwišn, ēwag ōh nīyōxšīšn.

2. abar drōn cē andar ham dar.

3. abar pāhrēz ī az x^vārišn ī mayēnišn⁵⁷ andar ham hangām ī ēzišn.

4. abar sāmān ī wāng pad Abistāg.gōwišnīh ī andar ēzišn ē ud Abistāg.dbišāmrūt ud ōrīšāmrūt ud caerδšūmrūt⁵⁸.

5. abar ēzišn rāyēnišn ud hān ēzišn kē zōt ayāb rāspīg tanāpuhlagān

6. abar zōtīh ī zan ud aburnāyīg.

7. abar wīzīr ī abar awē kē az Dēn ī Mazdēsn abāz stāyīd⁵⁹ bawēd.

8. abar wināh ī awē kē Gāhānbār nē yazēd ciyōn hān kaš yašt bawēd.

9. abar sāmān ī 5 gāh ī rōz ud šab ud ēzišn ī im gāhīh.

10. abar ēwēnagān ī x^vēšīh cīš ō Gāhānbār ud abārīg kirbag dādān dastwarīh.

11. abar candīh ī zohr ī az ēwag gospend nigērišn handāzišn ī andar kardan ī gospend, padēz dād pākīh az paywēšag ud abārīg āhōg, abē.wēmārīh, anizārīh ud a.xastagīh ī az xrafstr ud nērang ī kardan, wīzēn ī abar kīrdār ud sāxtār ud abar.burdār x^vardār awīš dādār.

⁵⁷ So Kotwal & Kreyenbroek 1995, 19. My own reading and translation were māyīšn, "copulation".

⁵⁸ The three last words are Avestan in Pahlavi pronunciation.

⁵⁹ An interesting example of the double meaning of stāyīdan / stūdan, like in Biblical Hebrew bārēk, "to bless/ to curse".

1. One section is the Nērangestān, the text about nērang in the worship of the Yazads, about that what is obligatory for one who goes to the Bridge, the increasing merit from a large number of the rāspīg priests in the worship, and that both zōt and the rāspīg priests should recite the Avesta together, and one should recite, while one should listen to.

2. About the drōn, and whatever on the same subject.

3. About abstention from drinking to drunkenness in the time of the worship.

4. About the limits of voice during the Avesta recital in the worship, and the Avestan texts that are recited twice, three times, four times.

5. About the arrangement of the worship and the worship in which the zōt or the rāspīg priests are guilty of the tanāpuhl sin.

6. About the zōt functions of a woman and a minor.

7. About the judgement of one who apostatized the Mazda-worshipping Religion.

8. About the sin of one who does not celebrate the Gāhānbār feast, as it is to be celebrated.

9. About the limits of the 5 gāh-s of the day and night, and the worship of these gāhs.

10. About the customs of giving out from his own, according to the dastwars, for the Gāhānbār and other merits.

11. About the quantity of zōhr-water from one sheep, the observation and reckoning in preparation the sheep, its freedom from contamination and other defects, as in the Law, and the not-being-ill, weak and injured, by the xrafstras, and the making of nērang, and the deciding as to the sacrificer, preparer the taker, and the carrier, the partaker, and the giver.

12. ud cīm ī kuštan cē andar ham dar.
 13. abar gāh ud kār ī zōt ud rāspīgān andar ēzišn.
 14. abar pahlom ēzišn dāhišn ī ō mard ī ahlaw ī cāšīdār abāz purstīdār xrad
 ī ahlawān būd cē andar ham darthā.
 15. abar šapīg ud kustīg kū az cē šāyēd cē andar ham darthā.
 16. ud abar barsom cīdan ud bastan, cē andar ham dar.
 17. abar paymānag ī ēzm andar ēzišn, ēwēn ī frāz.barišnīh, hān ī āta[x]š ī
 kadagīg, Adurag ud Ata[x]š ī Warhrān.
 18. abar ēzišn ī andar meh, ud hān ī andar miyānag ud hān ī andar
 kah.tuwānīgīh, ud wizīr ī abar atuwānīgīh.
 19. abar yaštan ī Yazdān hamē pad hān ī mad ēstēd ud abāz nē hīlēnd pad
 hic ēwēnag.
 20. abar kū mardom wēnāgīhā ud a.wēnāgīhā.z Yazdan ēzēnd, kū hān ī
 wēnāgīhā ud hān ī a.wēnāgīhā kadām, handarz ī abar wēnāgīhā yaštan ī
 Yazdān.
 21. abar pākth ī yaštār tan wastarg, āsūdagīh īš menišn az wināh ud pādyāb
 ī abzārth ud rōšnīh ud pākth ī gyāg ī ēzišn, dūrth az ānōh pad paymānag ī
 paydāg rēmanīh ud gand, cē andar ham dar.
 22. abar ēzišn ī Abān ūšān nām, zōr ī bēšizišnīh, warzāwandīh ī wahišt,
 dārišn dādārth ī Abān.mēnōg ud cē andar ham dar.
 23. abar ēzišn ī karān dādestān xōb frāgānīh ud xōb frajāmīh rāy kunīšn ud
 hānēz was ōsmurišn ī andar ham dar.
 24. ēzišn pad šāyēd nē šāyēd, xōb nē xōb.
 25. abar Zardu[x]štān Hīdva wištāspān dūdag pad ōsmurišn ī ēzišn ī Dēn
 ūšān ciyōnīh.

12. And the reason of the slaughter, and whatever on the same subject.
 13. About the place and the function of the zōt and rāspīg priests in the worship.
 14. About the the best worship, the gifts to the Righteous Man, the teacher and the inquirer of the
 wisdom of the righteous ones, and whatever is on the same chapters.
 15. About the sacred shirt and girdle, that is, from what it is proper (to make them), and
 whatever is on the same chapters.
 16. And about the gathering and tying the barsom, and whatever is on the same subject.
 17. About the quantity of the firewood in worship, the manner of offering it, the one of the
 household fire, the Adurag Fire, and the Bahrām Fire.
 18. About the worship with the greatest, the medium and the less ability, and the judgement about
 the lack of ability.
 19. About the worship of the Yazdas with that which has come, and not to omit in any way.
 20. About that that people worship the the Yazads visibly and also invisibly, on that which is
 visible and invisible, the advice about the worship the Yazads visibly.
 21. About the purity of the body and clothes of the celebrator, the rest of his mind from sin, the
 pādyāb-ablution of the tools, and the lightness and cleanliness of the place of worship, the
 distance therefrom in proportion of manifest pollution and stench, and whatever on the same
 subject.
 22. About the worship of waters and their names, the power of healing, the miraculous nature of
 Paradise, the continuous creatorship of the mēnōg-principle of the waters, and whatever on the
 same subject.
 23. About the need to perform ritual[s], religious acts and judgements a good beginning and a good
 end⁶⁷, and this, too, many considerations on the same subject.
 24. The worshiping must be carried out as it is proper and good.
 25. On the family of Zoroaster, Hvōv and Wīštāsp in the liturgy of the acts of worship of the
 Religion, and their nature.

67 So Zaehner 1955, 289; cf. also DkM 141.12, 336.2, etc.

Dk 8.46, DkM 786.11-23; DkD *missing folios* 136.10-137.12; West 1892, 169-171:

1. Yašt Gāθān cīyōn fradom zahag ī Ahunvar, tōhmagān tōhmag ī Dēn

ōšmurīšn ūš pad frawastārīh⁶⁰ ī Gāθān hamāg andarōn⁶¹ mārīg bun ī mārīg hast.

2. *bun⁶² [t] mārīg *ahw*⁶³ abāg *ahyāt* Gāθān bun sar mārīg ē hast, *vāstāram* abāg *va[h]yō* ī Gāθān sar, hamag ud ham <kē> *kū

<kē> cīyōnīh ēwēnag andar wizīdag ī azāš waxt andar hangīrdīgīh ī hamāg bārān ī Dēn.mazdēsn abargūd⁶⁴.

3. ūš gān abargāstān⁶⁵ ud hammiš Wisprad mādfīyān franāmišn ud stāyīšn ēzišn xʷānišn, ayāftan āfrēn ī pad dādār.frazānagīh rastagēnīdan pad padaš mehmanīh ī ēzišn ī yazdān [t] mēnōg rōšnēnīdan brāzēnīd ēsted.

4. har 3 passazag ē fradom abdom dādīh ī Stōd Yašt rāy gōwed.

5. hast pahlom ahlāyīh ābādīh, hast pahlom ābādīh ahlāyīh. abāg paccēn rāyēnīd.

60 Cereti 1997, 109: *parwastārīh*, "circolo".

61 Cereti 1997, 109: "Ahunvar".

62 Thus read with West 1892, 170 n. 1.

63 Written *ahw*, notes West, "as usual in Iran".

64 I adopt, tentatively, the reading and translation ("stored") of West. Cereti 1997, 109: **āfrīdan*, "lodare".

65 Cf. West 170, n. 7; "purport", *avorī-hastān*, or "disseminations", *avar-gāstān*.

68 West 1892, 169 n. 2.

69 The second part of this paragraph is problematic; it seems that the syntax was influenced by Avestan. My translation is completely different of that given in Cereti 1997, 109.

70 The first word of Ahunvar.

71 The last word of Ahunvar.

72 The first phrase of the Ašam Vohu prayer, *ahlāyīh ābādīh ī pahlom hast*, is glossed in a MS (Dhabhar 1963, 1 n. 2) by *kū ambār ī kīrbag weh*, "a store of good deeds is perfect".

Much ink was spilled on the translation of this short stanza; the translation adopted here, however, is that by Humbach and Ichaporia 1994, 19. It is as follows:

Since He is (the One) to be chosen by the world
therefore the judgement emanating from truth itself
(to be passed) on the deeds of good thought of the world,
as well as the power, is committed to Mazdā Ahura whom (people) assign
as the shepherd to the poor.

66 Cf. PY 19.4: Ahunvar hān mēnōg kē Dēn rawāg kunēd kē hān Dēn az Ahunvar brēhēnīd
estēd, "Ahunvar is that spirit which propagates the Religion, and by which the Avesta was formed/
declared"; DkM 789: Yaθā.ahū[k].vaīryō[k] pad bun ī Dēn ud azāš brēhēnīdagīh ī Naskān
azaš, "the Yaθā.ahū[k].vaīryō[k] is the basis of the Avesta and therefrom is the formation/
declaring of the Nasks".

In the Pahlavi Yasna, the Ahunvar, Y 27.13, is given actually in the Introductory Chapter to PY 15:

1. ciyōn ahū kāmāg [ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg] ēdōn radīhā [ēdōn frārdōnīhā] az ahlayīh [kār ud kirbag] cigāmāz [kār ud kirbag ēdōn frārdōnīhā kardan ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg]⁶⁷.

2. ī.š Wahman dāšn [kū hān mīzd ud pādāšn ī Wahman dahēd ō awē dahēd] kē andar axvān kunišn ī Ohrmazd [kū hān kuhēd ī Ohrmazd abāyēd. hast kē ēdōn gōwed ēd ī.š pad Wahman dāšn kū hān mīzd ud pādāšn ī pad Wahman bē dahēndāz *ō *awē awē dahēnd. ēd Adurbād ī Zardu(x)štān guft kū az hān ī Wahman dāšn *kū andar axvān kunišgar dānēnd]⁶⁸.

3. xVadāyīh ō Ohrmazd [kū.š xVadāyīh ī ēdōn pad sūd ī Ohrmazd dāšt bawēd] kē ō dīryōšān dahēd wāsān [kū.šān jādog.gōwīh kunēnd]⁶⁹.

67 Here, Yaθā ahū valriō is rendered, word by word, as ciyōn ahū kāmāg, kāmāg being a normal substitute for valriō, and ēdōn radīhā stands for aθā ratuš, while az ahlayīh renders ašdā[c]i hacā.

68 Here, dāzdā is rendered by dāšn, aghšūš is andar axvān, while ī.š ... kē is an attempt to translate the casus of Vaghšūš manāghō; another attempt is made by the glosses: pad Vohuman. kunišn ī Ohrmazd stands, of course, for šīlaoθananam ... mazdāi. As to the antiquity of the present Pahlavi version of the Ahunvar, note the order of words: 1) Vaghšūš 2) dāzdā 3) manāghō 4) šīlaoθananam 5) aghšūš 6) mazdāi, corresponding to the Pahlavi 1) Vohuman 2) dāšn kē andar 3) axvān 4) kunišn 5) Ohrmazd.

69 Here, xVadāyīh ō Ohrmazd renders xšāθarām ahurāi.ā (Pahlavi ō for Avestan ā?), while kē ō dīryōšān dahēd "translates" yīm drigubiliō dādā; one who cares for the poor, makes Ohrmazd to rule, diminishing the power of Ahriman and the dēws. wāsān translates here wāstārām; in many MSs we have here wrongly niyāyīšn, similar in writing. The word wāsān in the Ahunvar translates also vahyō in Y 53.9, seen as an import from the Ahunvar. The version of the Pahlavi Khurdah Avesta has here wastarg / wāstarg, translated as "nourishment", similarly to the Sanskrit version (āhāram, "food"). The lectio difficilior wāsān, used, after all, for wāstārām, "shepherd", perhaps could enable us to explain the contextually difficult āsānīh.dādār in Dk 9.21.3, about which Molé 1959, 284 n. 5, wrote that its Avestan equivalent is unknown. We may suggest that the Avestan original had had there *vāstara- "shepherd", which goes well in a Yima context, rendered wrongly, as an import from the Ahunvar (cf. the case of PY 53.9) as *wāsān, later "emended" into *āsān.dādār > āsānīh.dādār.

1. "As is the will of the spiritual lord [as is the will of Ohrmazd] so should be in the aspect of priestly mastership [so should he be in the aspect of virtuousness] owing to whatsoever of righteousness [duties and merits] [the duties and merits should be performed as virtuous as the will of Ohrmazd]".

2. "That whose gift is Wahman [i.e., the reward and recompence that Wahman gives, he gives to Him], one who among existences should work for Ohrmazd [i.e., he does what pleases Ohrmazd. There is someone who says "that whose gift is through Wahman", i.e., the reward and recompence that should be given through Wahman, they should give also to Him. Adurbād ī Zardu(x)štān said that by this gift of Wahman they will recognize the doer of good work in existences]".

3. "Sovereignty (belongs) to Ohrmazd [i.e., the sovereignty should be thus kept through the benefit (emanating from) Ohrmazd] by him who gives food and bed to the poor".

It should be, I believe, illustrative to provide here the plain Pahlavi version of the Ahunvar, cleared of the glosses and compared with the original Avestan, and then to give here the text of the glosses alone.

Yaθā ahū valrīθ aθā ratuš ašā.cit hacā

Varhāuš dazdā mananθō šīaoθananām anhāuš mazdāi
Xšaθranī ahurāi.ā yīm drīgubīθ dadai vāstārem

ciyōn ahū kāmāg ēdōn radīhā az ahlayīh cigāmāz

ī.š Wahman dāšn kē andar axvān kunišn ī Ohrmazd

xvādāyīh θ Ohrmazd kē θ drīyōšān dahēd wāsān

1 glosses: [ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg] [ēdōn frārōnīhā] [kār ud kirbag] [kār ud kirbag ēdōn frārōnīhā kardan ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg].

2 glosses: [kū hān mīzd ud pādāšn ī Wahman dahēd θ awē dahēd] [kū hān kunēd ī Ohrmazd abāyēd. hast kē ēdōn gōwēd ēd ī.š pad Wahman dāšn kū hān mīzd ud pādāšn ī pad Wahman bē dahēnd az *θ *awē awē dahēnd. ēd Adurbād ī Zardu(x)štān guft kū az hān ī Wahman dāšn *kū andar axvān kunišgar dānēnd].

3 glosses: [kū.š xvādāyīh ī ēdōn pad sūd ī Ohrmazd dāšt bawēd] [kū.šān jādōg.gōwīh kunēnd].

Among other versions of the Ahunvar prayer are the Introductory Chapter to PY 13 and a fragment in a shortened manthric form quoted in PY 28.

The first version reads as follows:

ciyōn ahū kāmāg [ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg] zōt frāz θ man gow, ciyōn ahū kāmāg [ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg] kē zōt hē frāz θ man gow, ēdōn radīhā [ēdōn dastwarīhā] az ahlayīh cigāmāz θ frāz ahlawān āgāhīhā gōwom [kū dānīšnīg gōwom kū hamāg kār ud kirbag ēdōn dastwarīhā kardan ciyōn Ohrmazd abāyēd].

There is no need to give here a comprehensive translation especially in view of the fact that this passage serves as a dialogue-box between two priests. Only a remark on the textual variants⁷⁰, radīhā is glossed here by dastwarīhā, at odds with frārōnīhā.

The gloss dastwarīhā, instead of frārōnīhā (compare dādwarīh and frārōnīh in the version of Ašam Vohū given in PY 20) is also the reading of several MSs of the Pahlavi Khurdeh Avesta. Dk 8.39.3 has xvādāy for ahū and dastwar for rad, cf. dastwar in PY 13. The second version reads just ciyōn ahū kāmāg [ciyōn Ohrmazd kāmāg].

⁷⁰ Humbach 1984, 54, has shown how important can be Pahlavi variants of Avestan prayers.

APPENDIX III

Aṣəm Vohū, Y 27.14, is one of the most sacred Zoroastrian prayers. A Sogdian transcription of the *Aṣəm Vohū* prayer, the real Avestan text, in Sogdian characters and in Sogdian pronunciation, was made known by Gershevitch 1976a⁷¹. The Avestan text is as follows:

Aṣəm vohū vahištəm asti

ušta asti ušta ahmāi

hiiaṭ aṣāi vahištəm aṣəm.

The translation adopted here is, as in many other cases, that by Humbach and Ichaporia 1994, 20. Their translation is as follows:

Truth is best (of all that is) good.

As desired, what is being desired

is truth for Him/him who (represents) best truth.

or:

Truth is best (of all that is) good.

As desired, as desired, truth

is truth for Him/him who (represents) best truth.

⁷¹ Manichaean knowledge of the Zoroastrianism: the Sogdianized Avestan in the Sogdian fragment republished in Sims-Williams 1976 is older than even the "Ancient Letters", dating from an epoch prior to Mani, meaning that this small but important part of the Zoroastrian canon was known in Sogdiana before the Sasanian period.

The prayer in Pahlavi is as follows:

Aṣəm Vohū[k] Bun: ahišyih ābādih ī pahlom hast. nēwag hast [ahišyih],
nēwag awē kē ahišyēnīdār hān ī pahlom ahišyih,

The original of the Aṣəm Vohū[k]: righteousness is the perfect excellence/boon. Virtuous is [righteousness], virtuous is one who makes righteous the perfect righteousness.

This first gāh of the formula, in different magical combination, signs every chapter of Dk 8. The combinations of the *manthra* in Dk 8.46.5, the last § of Dk 8, are taken from the Aṣəm Vohū prayer, as interpreted in Y 20, the second chapter of the Bagān Yašt):

hast pahlom ahišyih ābādih, hast pahlom ābādih ahišyih. abag paccēn
rāyēnīd.

Perfect righteousness is the boon, the perfect boon is the righteousness. Arranged with the copy.

The Pahlavi version of the *manthra* shows disregard for grammatical rules⁷²:

aṣəm vohu vahištəm asti, ahišyih ābādih ī pahlom hast;

ušta asti ušta ahmai, nēwag hast [ahišyih], nēwag awē;

hyaṭ aṣāi vahištai aṣəm, kē ahišyēnīdār hān ī pahlom ahišyih.

⁷² Cf. Humbach 1984, 52ff.: according to Humbach, *ibid.*, the translator "had no clear idea of the meaning of the Avestan original of the formula. His basic mistake was that he translated *ahmai*, "to him" by *o*/, "he" [awē]. By consequence, he was compelled to invent the meaning "sanctifier" ["one who makes righteous"] for the final *aṣəm* (normally rendered by Phlv. *ahlayih*, "righteousness, truth")".

The text of Y 20.1-3 is as follows:

1. frāmraot ahurō mazdā ašē vohū vahištē asti para ahmāi vohū
vahištē cinasti yaθa xvaētaue xvaētatē vohu vahištē asti aθa ī
kaēšē kārāileiti.
2. uštā asti uštā ahmāi uštātāitīa vīspām ašauuanēm vīspāi ašaonē
para.cinasti yaθa nā stāitīa vīspām ašauuanēm vīspāi ašaonē
para.cinasti.
3. hyāt ašāi vahištāi ašē para.cinasti vīspām māθrēm vīspām māθrāi
yaθa ašāi xšaθrēm cinasti yaθaca zbaliēntē ašaonē ašam cinasti yaθaca
xšmauuoīia ašē cinasti yašt saōšīlāntaēbiō ērāiō īkaēša vīspām vacō
frauuākēm haurum vacō ahurahe mazdā.

- 1.⁷³ Ahura Mazda proclaimed: "truth is the best good". (By this) he refers best good to it/him in the same way as (one refers) family membership to the family. (He says:) "It is the best good". Thus he makes known the reference.
2. "At wish what is wished for belongs to him". He refers every truthful to every truthful in the *Uštāness* in the same way as he refers every truthful to every truthful in the *Astī*-ness.
3. He refers "Truth to best truth" (i.e.,) that which includes all formulas to that which includes all formulas, in the same way as he refers power to truth, and in the same way as he refers truth to the calling righteous one, and in the same way as (he refers truth) to you, the Saōšyants. (There are) the three references. Each (single) word (forms) the proclamation, the complete word of Ahura Mazda.

73 Translated in Humbach 1984, 54.

The version given in PY 20 is as follows:

1. frāz.gōwišn būd ī Ohrmazd: *ašəm vohū vahīštəm asti* (ahlāyīh ābādīh ī pahlom hast). bēš ō awē ābādīh ī pahlom cāšt bawēd [kūš nēwagīh padaš kard bawēd] kē hān xvēš xvēš.rawīšnīh kunēd [kū hān abāyēd dādan bē dahēd]. pad *ašəm vohū vahīštəm asti* ēdōn dādwarīh hangīrdīgīh būd [kūš sar būd].

2. *uštā asti uštā ahmāi* nēwag.rawīšnīh ī harwispēn ahlawān [ōh abāyēd būdan] harwispēn ahlawān bē cāšt bawēd [kūš nēwagīh padaš kard bawēd] kē mard [h]astīšnīh [xvēškārīh] harwispēn ahlawān [ōh abāyēd kardan] ō harwispēn ahlawān bē cāšt bawēd [kūš nēwagīh padaš kardan bawēd].

3. *hyaē ašāi vahīštāi ašəm* bēš cāšt bawēd harwisp [kār ud kirbag] pad mānēr [paydāg] ō awē harwisp mānēr [kē Abistāg Zand warm kū hān ī harwisp hamāg kār ud kirbag pad Abistāg Zand paydāg kunēd]. *kē ō ahlāyīh* xVadāyīh cāšēd [kū pādixšāyīh pad frārōnīh kunēd. hād dādestānīh ō kū pad frārōnīh xVadāyīh cāšēd kū pādixšāyīh pad frārōnīh dārēd] kē.z ō awē xVāndār ī ahlaw rāstīh cāšēd [kū wizēr rāst kunēd] kē.z ō šmāh rāstīh cāšēd kū sūdōmand hēd [kū dādwarīh rāst kunēd]. 3 dādwarīh [hād kūš wizēr 3 andar būd], harwisp gōwišn frāz gōwišn būd hamāg gōwišn hān ī Ohrmazd būd.

1. Ahura Mazda proclaimed: *ašəm vohū vahīštəm asti* ("righteousness is perfect excellence"). He (thus) teaches the perfect excellence/prosperity to him [i.e., He works goodness thereby] who himself exercises the conduct derived from his inner self [i.e., he gives what is proper to be given]. Through (the formula) *ašəm vohū vahīštəm asti* (His) judgment was thus encompassed [it was summarized].

2. *uštā asti uštā ahmāi* Proper behavior of all the righteous ones [so should it be] He teaches all the righteous ones [i.e., He works goodness thereby]. Who, man⁷⁴, the existence [duty] *of all the righteous ones [so should be done] teaches all the righteous ones [i.e., He works goodness thereby].

3. *hyaē ašāi vahīštāi ašəm* He teaches all [proper deeds and merits] through manthras [revealed] to these all manthras [i.e., one who memorized the Avesta with its *Zand* is one who makes all these proper deeds and merits manifest through the Avesta with its *Zand*]. One who teaches righteousness to the royalty [i.e., that they should exercise the rulership through honesty]. The meaning of this is that that he teaches the royalty through honesty, to keep the rulership in honesty]. Also one who teaches truth to the calling righteous one [that he should make truthful decisive judgments], also one who teaches you truth, you who are the profitable one [that you should make truthful decisive judgments]. Three judgments [i.e., there are three decisive judgments therein]: each statement was a proclamation, all the statements were those of Ohrmazd.

74 A senseless mistake for Avestan nā.

WZs 28.1-6, Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 90-93, quoted also in Cereti 1997, 111:

fradomth Ahunvar baxšthist 3 paymān ciyōn pad any dar nimūd, pad hamristīg Gāθānāz 3 T hast gāh ud 4 gāh ud 5 gāh; ēdōnāz Naskān 3 T xVānthēd Gāθānīg ud Hādō[k].Māñerīg ud Dādīg. ud pas baxšthist Ahunvar 6 T nēm.gāh xVāñēnd; ēdōnāz Gāθān 6 T xVānthēd Ahunawad gāh ud Haptān Yasn ud Uštad gāh ud Spandmad Gāh ud Wobuxštar Gāh ud Wahištošt Gāh; ēdōnāz Naskān 6 ciyōn Gāθān 2 T xVānthēd 1 Gāθān T Gāθānīg T hast Yašt, 1 abārtīg Gāθān; Hādō[k].Māñerāz 2 T 1 māñer T purr.daxšag T āraštār T hast Pājag ud Ratwištāiti ud 1 māñer T purr.daxšag T weh T hast abārtīg Hādō[k].Māñer; ud Dādāz 2, 1 Dād T Jud.Dēw T hast Widēwdād ud 1 Dād T Zardu[x]št T hast abārtīg dād.

pas baxšthist 21 ciyōn Ahunvar 21 mārīg ud Gāθān 21 T hast Ahunvar ahlāyīh.stāyīšnīh ud Yazdān kirdārīh az Yānimmanō tā 6 Erman T āgenēn 21 Naskān 21. pas baxšthist Gāθān 288 wecest Naskānāz 6 ristagān 288...

pas baxšthist Gāθān 1 hazār ud 16 gāh ud Naskān 6 hazār ud 1 fragard; ciyōn Hādōxt rad hast T Naskān Erman T pahlom gōwišn T abar Ristāxēz rad hast T fragardān ud abar abārtīg fragardān ... be hambūd ... ud pas baxšthist Gāθān 6 hazār ud 666 mārīg ud Naskānāz hāmīst 6 hazār ud 666 dādestān padāš brīdag; 6 hazār ud 666 mārīg T pad Gāθān nimūdār hast T az petyārag 6 dām madan tā be 6 frajām T 6 hazārag; har hazārag 6 10 sadōsem T bawēd ... Gāθān 6 mārīg T fradom nimūdār hast T 6 hazārag ud pas 60 sadōzem ud pas 600 hān T 600 wōiy ud pas 6 hazār hān T 6 hazār sāl.

First, the Ahunvar is divided into 3 mesures, as indicated in another chapter, in the same manner as the Gāθās (are divided) into 3, which are 3 metrical lines (gāh), 4 and 5; thus, too, the Nasks (are divided) into 3 (groups), which are called Gāθic, and Haḏā.Māñeric, and Dādīc. And, then, the Ahunvar is divided into 6, which are called half-metrical lines (half-gāh); thus, too, the Gāθās are divided into 6, which are called Ahunawad gāh and Haptān Yasn and Uštad gāh and Spandmad Gāh and Wobuxštar Gāh and Wahištošt Gāh; thus, too, the Nasks (are divided) into 6, as the Gāθās (are divided) into 2, which are called, one, the Gāθānīg Gāθās, which is the Yašt, the other (is called) "the other Gāθās"; the Haḏā.Māñeric (part is divided) into 2, as well, one of which is the fully-characteristic and organized *manthra*, which is the Pājag and Ratwištāiti, and one is the fully-characteristic and good *manthra*, which is the other Haḏā.Māñer; the Dād, too, (is divided) into 2, one is the "Law Breaking off with the Dēws" (Dād T Jud.Dēw), which is the Widēwdād, one is the "Law of Zoroaster" (Dād T Zardu[x]št), which is the other Laws.

Again, (the Gāθās) are divided into 21, as the Ahunvar has 21 words and the Gāθās into 21, i.e., the Ahunvar and the divine activity of the Yānimmanō (Y 28.0) until the Erman (Y 54) are together 21; the Nasks are (too,) 21. Again, the Gāθās are divided into 288 strophes, the Nasks, too, into 288 ristags...

Again, the Gāθās are divided into 1016 metrical lines (gāh) and the Nasks (are divided) into into 1001 fragards; as the Hādōxt Nask is the spiritual chief of the Nasks, so Erman, the best spell for the Resurrection, is the spiritual chief of the fragards and is attached to the other fragards...

And again, the Gāθās are divided into 6666 words and the Nasks, too, together, into 6666, according to which the judgments are cut; the 6666 words that are in the Gāθās manifest the coming of the Adversary into the Creation until the end of the six millenia; each millenium has 10 centuries... The 6 first words of the Gāθās manifest the six millenia, and again, the 60 centuries, and again, the 600 decades, and again the six millenia.

[TEXT I] Y 45.1:

aṭ frauuaxšiiā nū gōšō.dūm nū sraotā

yaēcā asnāṭ yaēcā dūrāṭ išaθā

nū īm vīspā ciθrā zī mazdāñhō.dūm

nōiṭ datbitīm duš.sastīš ahūm marašiiāṭ

akā varanā draguuā¹ hizuuā āuuaratō.

"Now I shall proclaim, listen now, hear now, O you, who are approaching from near and far, now take note of the world for it is bright. May the deceitful blasphemer, by his evil choice, not destroy the (world) a second time¹ with his tongue through preference being given to him".

Y 45.4:

aṭ frauuaxšiiā aṇhōuš aṇiā vahištām

ašāṭ hacā mazdā vaēda yā īm dāṭ

ptarēm vanhōuš vərəzaiantō manahō

aṭ hōi dugadā hušiiāoθanā ārmaitīš

nōiṭ dipžaidiiāṭ vīspā.hišas ahurō.

"Now I shall proclaim the best of the existence. In accordance with truth I know Him, who created it, (I know Him), the father of the abundant good thought, O Mazdā, and His daughter (is) right-mindedness of good works. The all-seeing Ahura is undeceivable".

[TEXT II] PY 45.1:

a. ēdon frāz gōwišn [Dēn] ud nūn niyō[x]šišn dahišn ud nūn āšnawišn [kū gōš andar dārišn ud warm bē kunišn ud ōh gōwišn]

b. kē.z az nazdīg ud kē.z az dūr xʷāhēd [hān hēbadīstān kardan ūš ēdon kunišn]

c. cē nūn ēn harwisp.paydāg kū Ohrmazd dād [kū ēn dām hamāg Ohrmazd dād]

d. kū nē pad hān didīgartar zamān [pad tan ē pasēn] awē ī duših hammōxtār

[Gannāg Mēnōg] axʷān marnjēnād

e. hān aš wadtar kāmāg ud hān aš druwandth pad uzwān

wurōyēnēd [Gannāg Mēnōg],

a. "Thus it is to be proclaimed [the Religion] and now it is to be heard and reflected upon and listened now [that one has to hearken and to memorize and to say so]

b. One who is seeking from near and far [that one has thus to acquire this learning]

c. for now it is revealed to all that that Ohrmazd created [that Ohrmazd created all this creation]

d. i.e., not for this (even more) second time [in the Final Body] the teacher of evilness [the Stinking Spirit] shall destroy worlds

e. that he may not make to choose evil will and wickedness with his tongue [of the Stinking Spirit]".

1 Or, "the one of evil doctrine shall not destroy existence a second time".

PY 45.4:

a. ēdōn frāz gōwom andar axvān hān ī awē [ī Ohrmazd xvēš] pahlom

[xvēdōdah kardan]

b. az ahlāyīh āgānīh Ohrmazd āgāh kē ēn dād [xvēdōdah kardan]

c. Ūš pad pidarīh Wahman warzīd [kūš frārōn frārōnīh ī dāmān rāy xvēdōdah kard]

d. ēdōn hān ī duxt ī hukunišn ī bawandag.menīšn [Spendarmat *kē az xvēdōdah kardan abāz nē ēstād]

e. nē frēft [kū az xvēdōdah kardan abāz nē ēstād] cē harwisn.nigērdār pad hān ī Ohrmazd [kū pad dēn ī Ohrmazd hamāg kār ud dādestān ōh bawēd],

a. "Thus I proclaim in these [Ohrmazd's own] worlds which are the best [to perform xvēdōdah]

b. Through knowledge of truth Ohrmazd knows who established it [the performance of xvēdōdah]

c. And he begot Wahman through fatherhood [i.e., the righteous performed xvēdōdah for the righteousness of the creations]

d. Thus His daughter of good works who is complete mindfulness [Spendarmat who did not desist from performing xvēdōdah]

e. did not deceive [who did not desist from performing xvēdōdah] for (she is) the complete observer in what belongs to Ohrmazd [i.e., that so must be all the action and judgment in the Religion of Ohrmazd]".

[TEXT III] Dk 9.38

1. 15-om fragard at frauuaxšīiā abar 7 pahlomīh ī Dēn handarz.

2. fradom hamīh abāz Dādār Spenāg Mēnōg pad niyō(x)šīdan hammōxtan warzīdan īš Dēn ud ēnāz kū padaš bawēd bōxtagīh hān ī weh dahišn az Ebgad.

3. Didīgar abar judāgīh ī az marnjēnīdār Gannāg Mēnōg nikōhīdan īš az tarmenišnīh ud drōzanīh sar īš har āhōg.

5. Cahārom abar pahlomīh ī xvēdōdah ciyōnāš kē ka xVadīh dahišnīh ūš dādestān ī xvēš zahagīg ō zahagīg paydāgīh ud paywandišnīh wistarišnīgīh ud kārīgīh ud sūdīgīh ud xVadīh ud dahišnīh, xvēdōdah,

6. fradom Dādār Ohrmazd pad pidarīh ī Wahman ī fradom zahag warzīd ud az hān warzišnīh mēnōgīg ud gētīgīg dām rawāgīh ud was paywandīg ciyōn az rōšn brāh ud az brāh fērōg az fērōg bām būdan, pur.rawīšnīhā wistardan ud ō Frašgird paywastan mardom padēz mēnōgīg ud gētīgīg widarīgīh ī andar mēnōg ud gētīg Spendarmat hān mādarīg xVarrāh padīruftārīh wāspuhragānēntīdan.

1. "The 15th fragard At frauuaxšīiā about the seven perfections of the injunction of the Religion.

2. First, association with the Holy Spirit of the Creator through hearing, study, practising His Religion, and this, too, that thereby will be the salvation of the good creation from the Assault.

3. Second, about separation from the destructor, the Stinking Spirit, execrating him for his perversiveness and falsehood, which is/are the source of all his vices.

5. Fourth, about the perfection of the next-of-kin marriage which is when essence-creation² (occurs); and the judgment about it is one's own progenical goodness (to be given) to manifestation of the progeny, and kinship, cherishing, effectiveness, profitability, and the selfhood and giving, (which is) the next-of-kin marriage,

6. (that) was first accomplished by the Creator Ohrmazd through (his) fatherhood of Wahman, (his) first child, and from this begetting (occurs) the setting in motion of the mēnōg- and gētīg- creation[s] and much descendancy, as from light (arises) splendor, radiance from splendor, brilliance from radiance, in order to spread the full progressive diffusion and to attach mankind to the Renovation, and also, through the entrance of the mēnōg- and gētīg- qualities into the sphere of the mēnōg and gētīg, Spendarmat was princely ennobled by (her) acceptance of the maternal glory".

2. Other translations are also possible, though none would reflect exactly the Pahlavi idiom; cf. further.

[TEXT IV] Dk 9.60: 1.

Cahārdahom fragard at frauuaxšīiā hād hānēz ī hammōzišn niyō[x]šīšn and cand ēdar abāyēd hān ī ahammōzišn niyō[x]šīšn ēwbar əš hišt Zardu[x]št.

2. ud ēnāz kū kē ō kunišngarān zāyēnīdārīhā əš kunišn pahlom ēwēn ī fradom xVēdōdah stāyīd bawēd cīyōn kunišngarān zāyēnīdārīh mardom pidarīh mardom xōb pidarīh pad xōb kirdārīh zahagīh ud xōb kirdār zahagīh pad fradom dām xēmīhā zahag andar xVēš warzīdārīh ud zahag andar xVēš warzīdārīh xVēdōdah bawēd ud hān ī ka kunišngarān zāyēnīdār mardom pidarīh stāyēd əš xVēdōdahēz stāyīd bawēd.

3. ud ēnāz kū kē dām pad frārōnīh əš frārōn frawardārīh dāmān rāy xVēdōdah kardan cāšt bawēd frārōnīh əš frārōnīh padēz ēn cim cē dām pad frārōnīh dāštan rāy ō frārōn xēmīh ī amargānīg handāzēd hān ī zāddād pad cīhr az xVēdōdah ī amargānīg.

4. ud ēnāz kūš Spendarmat pad duxtarīh ō Ohrmazd cāšt bawēd kē xrad pad bawandag.menišnīh, ēdēz rāy cē xrad bawandag.menišnīh andar kanārag hēnd ī Ohrmazd ud Spendarmat, ud xrad hān ī Ohrmazd ud bawandag.menišnīh hān ī Spendarmat ud bawandag.menišnīh xrad zahag cīyōn Spendarmat Ohrmazd, ud az ēd bē guft cīmīg kū kēš bawandag.menišnīh ō xrad paywast əš Spendarmat pad duxtarīh ō Ohrmazd cāšt bawēd.

5. ud ēnāz kūš ēdōn hān duxtarīhā kunišn cāšt bawēd kē ahlāyīh pad bawandag.menišnīh ud kē.z yazīšn pad bawandag.menišnīh kū yazīšn ud abārīg kirbag bawandag.menišnīhā kunēd,

1. The fourteenth *fragard*, At frauuaxšīiā, is that the instruction is to be listened to here as much as possible, (so that even) one to whom it should not be taught shall listen to it once; he, Zoroaster, allowed it.

2. And this, too, that the perfect effect of the pre-eminent custom of the next-of-kin marriage is praised by him who acts as a causer of procreation towards the benefactors, as to cause the procreation among the benefactors is the fatherhood of mankind, and the proper fatherhood of mankind is through the properly produced progeny, and the properly produced progeny is through children (born) according to the nature of the first creature, (through) begetting³ of one's own, and the child (begotten by) begetting of one's own is the (fruit of the) next-of-kin marriage; and when a causer of procreation among the benefactors praises the fatherhood of mankind, the next-of-kin marriage is also praised by him.

3. And this, too, by one whose creatures are in merit, for his meritorious cherishing of the creatures, the performance of the next-of-kin marriage is taught; the merit is his merit; even for this reason, in order to keep the creatures in merit, he allots to the meritorious, which is born, the general⁴ character, created through good seed from the general⁵ next-of-kin marriage.

4. And this, too, that one whose wisdom is through complete mindfulness teaches Spendarmat's daughterhood to Ohrmazd, for the reason that wisdom (and) complete mindfulness are within the domain of Ohrmazd and Spendarmat, while wisdom being Ohrmazd, and complete mindfulness being Spendarmat, (with) complete mindfulness being the child of wisdom, just as Spendarmat (is the child) of Ohrmazd; owing to this, one could say with (good) reason that by one whose complete mindfulness is associated with wisdom, Spendarmat's daughterhood to Ohrmazd can be taught.

5. And this, too, the action by way of this daughterhood is taught by one whose righteousness is through complete mindfulness, and also by one whose ritual performances are through complete mindfulness, so that they shall perform ritual and other pious work[s] through complete mindfulness⁶.

³ Thus translated according to PY 45.4c.

⁴ Or, "of the immortals" (cf. Sanjana's translation in Sanjana XIX, 36).

⁵ Cf. the previous note.

[TEXT V] Dk 9.15 (cf. DkM 802-3; DkS XVII, 33-5; DkD missing folios 160; West 1882, 369-382; West 1892, 197-9; Nyberg 1933, 338-9; Widengren 1938, 221):

14-om fragard Adfravaxšyā abar nīmūdan ī Ohrmazd ō Zardu(x)št ruwān ī Keršāsp samgōnThā⁶ ud tars ī Zardu(x)št az hān ī samgōnTh ud pašēmānTh guftan ī Keršāsp az amārThā zadan īš mardom [ud] burzīdan īš pahrežēxtāgān ī az wināh ud cašmāgānTh⁷ īš az dādār Ohrmazd pad zadan īš āta(x)š.

2. ud xVāstan ī Keršāsp az Ohrmazd hān ī pahlom axVān pad hān kirdārTh kaš kušt Aži Srōbar ud stahmagTh ī hān petyārag, ud kaš wānīd Gandarf ī zalrī pašnan⁸, [ud] škeftTh ī hān druj ud kaš zad hunušag ī Nēwīgān ud dāštānīgān [ud] grān anāgTh ud wizand ī azēšān, ud kaš rāmēnīd tagīg wād az gēhān ziyānTh abāz ō dāmān sūdTh āwurd padēz hān ī ka Dahāg az bānd hāzrag bawēd ud pad murnjēnīdan ī gēhān abar dwārēd ud dām abesThēnīdārTh grāyēd, awē hangēzēhēd ud pad wānīdan ī awē hān ī was ōz druj ō gēhān dām pahrextan.

3. hamēmānTh ī āta(x)š ō Keršāsp pad must ī padēš kard, abāz dāstan īš az wahišt ud ayārTh. ī Gōšurun awīš pad āzbādTh ī padēš kard ud pādan īš az dušax⁹.

4. ud xVāhišn ī Zardu(x)št ō āta(x)š abar āmurzīdan īš az wināh ud hanjāftan ī āta(x)š hān ī xVāhišn ud franaftan ī Keršāsp ruwān ō hamast axVān.

5. ahlayTh pahlom hast ābādTh.

6 Nyberg: samakanThā ("qu'était dans un état épouvantable"); sahmagānThāz

7 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎, a corruption for 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎, cf. MacKenzie 1980, 293.

8 Nyberg: "aux talons jaunes". 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 "simple transcription pehlevie du mot avestique zalrī.pāšnā- (Yašt 5.38; 19.41) avec la désinence moyen-irahienne -ān".

1. The 14th fragard Adfravaxšyā. About demonstrating the soul of Keršāsp, awefully⁹, by Ohrmazd to Zoroaster, and the fear of Zoroaster (caused) by this awefulness, and the expressing of repentance by Keršāsp on account of his having slain enumerable people and (his) extolling of those who avoid from sin and his condemnation by the Creator Ohrmazd because of his having smitten the Fire.

2. And the supplication of Keršāsp for the best existence by virtue of these exploits when he killed the horned serpent Aži Srōbar and the terror (caused) by this adversity, and when he overcame Gandarf of golden heels and the monstrosity of that druj, and when he killed the evil progeny of Nivika and Dāštānīg and the severe evil and harm caused by them, and when he appeased the swift-strong storm from damaging the world and emended it benefiting the creations, and also through it that when Dahāg will get loose from his bounds and will daevically rush to destroy the world and will desire / daevically chatter the destruction of the creation, he (Keršāsp) will be roused and will assist the world and the creation in overcoming this powerful druj.

3. The opposition of Fire towards Keršāsp because of the violence he committed to it and the keeping him away¹⁰ [from Paradise, and the aid of Gōšurun to him through the cultivation¹¹ he performed for Her and the protection of him] from Hell.

4. And the supplication of Zoroaster to Fire about pardoning him of his sin, and carrying out by Fire of¹² that supplication, and the ascend of the soul of Keršāsp to Limbo.

5. Of the righteousness perfect is prosperity.

9 There are many ways to express this idea in Pahlavi, while the normal form of the word so translated here should be rather *sahmgēnThā, from sahm, not from sam. I suspect the word in this passage is a result of a peculiar interpretation of the proper name Sā[h]m, frequently used in connection with Keršāsp. It is of interest that in Sogdian Manichaica, the Biblical 𐭪𐭫 king of Bāšān, one of the giants survived the flood thanks to his tailure and who fought the drake, was transformed into S'hm Keršāspa.

10 The words in brackets occur only in DkK; cf. West 1882, 319, 380.

11 Or, "deliverance", āzādTh.

12 Read with DkD; DkM has hncōtTh, K has hncōtTh. West rendered "compliance" (haryāftanē). Or, "the lament of the Fire on that supplication", for hnglōdytTh, "to lament", cf. MacKenzie 1980, 294.

[TEXT XI] ZWY 9.19-23:

19. āta[x]š gōwēd: "kū nē waxšēm", ud āb gōwēd kū: "nē tazēm".

20²³. ud pas man Ōhrmazd ī dādār ō Srōš ud Nēryōsang²⁴ Yazad gōwēm kū:
"tan ī Sāmān Keršāsp bē jumbānēnēd, tā abar āxēzēd".

21. ud pas Srōš ud Nēryōsang Yazad ō Keršāsp šawēnd, se bār wāng
kunēnd.

22. ud cahārom bār, abāg pērōzgarīh, Sām²⁵ abar āxēzēd, padīrag Až. Dahag
šawēd, ūš saxvan azāš nē ašnūyēd, ūš gad ī pērōzgar ō sar pahikōbēd ud
zanēd ud ōzanēd.

23. pas ud drōšag ud pīdyārag az ēn gēhān bē šawēd tā hazārag bun kunēm.

19. The Fire says: "I will not spread", and the Water says: "I will not flow".

20. And then I, Ōhrmazd, the Creator, shall speak to Srōš and Nēryōsang Yazad: "Stir the
body of Keršāsp the son of Sām, so that he will rise up".

21. And then Srōš and Nēryōsang Yazad will go to Keršāsp and exclaim three times.

22. And the fourth time, Sām will rise up with triumph and go forward. Až! Dahag will not
listen to his words, he will strike the triumphant club on the head, and will smite and kill him.

23. Then deceit and adversity will depart from this world, till I complete the millenium.

[TEXT XII] AyJ 17.6:

pas Ōhrmazd Srōš ud Nēryōsang frēstēd kū: "Sām ī Narēman bē hangēzēd".

Then Ōhrmazd will send Srōš and Nēryōsang Yazad, saying: "Raise up Sām the son of
Narēman".

²³ ZWY 9.20-22, Kreyenbroeck 1985, 131.

²⁴ It is worth noting that here Nēryōsang has a function of assisting to destroy the monstrous
creatures, so similar to his function in the Manichaean myth. Cf. Benveniste 1932-33, 185, Cumont
1908, 16-26.

²⁵ Kreyenbroeck, *ibid.*, "It is Sām, however, who is actually raised up".

[TEXT XIII] Bnd 33.33-35:

pas nazd ō hazārag sar ī Ušēdarmāh, Dahag az band harzag bawēd.
Bēwarasp was dām ud dahišn pad dēw.kāmagīh wināhēd.

ud andar hān hangām Sošyans ī Zardu[x]štān ō paydāgīh rasēd ud sī rōz ud
šab xvaršēd pad bālist ī asmān ēstēd, nazdist az gētīgān rist ī Sāmān
Keršāsp ul hangēzēnd ī Bēwarasp pad gad zanēd ud ōzanēd ud az dāmān abāz
dāfēd, hazārag ī Sošyans bun bawēd, ciyōn hazārag ī awē ī tan.kirdār
panjah ud haft sāl.

Then, near the end of Hōšēdar.Māh's millenium, Dahag will be free from fetters;
Bēwarasp will injure many creatures and creation with the daevic desire. And at that time,
Sošyans son of Zoroaster will appear and for thirty days and nights, the Sun will stand at the
zenith of the sky.

Of earthy beings, they will first raise the dead body of Keršāsp son of Sām, who will smite
Bēwarasp with the mace, and kill, and withhold him from the creatures; the millennium of
Sošyans will begin.

Sām rāy gōwēnd kū: ahōš būd, pad hān ka.š tarr.mēnīd Dēn. ī Mazdēsnaē,
 Turk ē kē Nāyin xVānēnd kš xVart ēstād, pad tēr bē winast, ud ānōh pad
 dašt ī Pēšyānsī ēš hān ī abārōn bōšāsp abar burd ēstād, ud miyān ī garm
 nībast ēstād, ēš bāfr azabar nīšast ēstād, pad hān kār kū, kš Aži.Dahāg
 harzag bawēd, awē āxēzēd ēš bē zanēd, aš bēwar Fravahr ī ašōgān pānag
 hēnd.

Dahāg kē Bēwarāspaz xVāhēnd rāy gōwēd kū Frēdōn ka.š awē bē grift pad
 kuštan nē šayēst ūš pas pad kōf ī Dumbāwand bē bast ka harzag bawēd, Sām
 āxēzēd ūš gad zanēd ud āzanēd.

About Sām they say that he is immortal, on the grounds that when he offended the Mazdaean religion, a Turk called Nāyin²⁶ shot him with an arrow while he was sleeping and there, in the plain of Pēšānsē, he was in sinful sloth, he slept in the middle of wormwood and snow was above him, (he was preserved for the day that when Aži Dahāg will be free he will rise and smite him). A myriad frawahrs of righteous men are his guardians²⁷.

One says of Dahāg who is also called Bēwarāsp, that when Frēdōn captured him he was unable to kill him and he then bound him in Mt. Dumbāwand; when he shall become at loose, Sām will arise and smite with his mace and kill him.

²⁶ Clearly enough, the figure of Sām, one of the Manichaean giants, is modelled here on Bahrām Cōbēn, where the episod of the arrow is inverted. The name of Nāyin or Nāyon, being a Turkic Buddhist title, indicates a rather late date of this interpolation.

²⁷ Cf. DD 16.5: ham.passazag andarēz Dēn stācy>īd ēstād āišān.Fravahrān kē abar nigāh dārēnd hān karb ī Sāmān Keršāsp ud hānēz spāhīgān az gyān ud tan bē hān cīm rāy, "Befittingly even in the Scriptures are praised those Frawahrs who keep a watch over the astral body of Keršāsp, son of Sām and even other soldiers with life and body for that reason" (cf. Kangs 1969, 78).

[TEXT XV]

Y 51.1 is given here according to the translation by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 96-7:

Vohū xšaerem vairīm	bāgam abī.bairištəm
viđišamnāi tžāctī	ašā antara caraitī
šītaoθanāiš mazdā vahištəm	taī nō nūctī varəšanē,

The good power worthy of being chosen, which brings most share(s) (and which is) best through actions, comes to the person liberal even with abundance, through truth. This (power), O Mazda, I will procure for us now.

[TEXT XVI] The Pahlavi version (PY 51.1) is as follows:

σ.m²⁸ awē ī weh xvadāy kāmāg bahr. abar barišnH [kū bār σ awē kas dahom
kē xvadāy ī nēwag abāyed]
pad bē dahišnH abzōn rāst andarg kunēd [pad dahišn ī rāstihā bē dahēd hān
mard kē xvadāy ī nēwag abāyed]
kunišn ī Ohrmazd pahlom hān ī amāh nūnaz [ka Dēn rawāg bē kard] warzišn.

My desire is to bring the portion (taxes) to him who is a good ruler [I will give taxes to that person who should be a good ruler]²⁹

*with but abundant giving the righteous one performs in between*³⁰ [that man who should be a good ruler will give out through righteous gifts].

It is up to us now to perform the best action of Ohrmazd [when he (the good ruler) propagates the Religion].

General remarks: this is an interlinear translation; this is especially obvious when one compares line 2 in Pahlavi against its Avestan original. It is the gloss "that man who should be a good ruler will give out through righteous gifts" that makes sense of the Avestan viđišamnāi tžāctī ašā antara caraitī and its awful word-by-word rendering, pad bē dahišnH abzōn rāst andarg kunēd, to which I offer a very tentative translation. However, pad bē dahišnH supports the reading viđišamnāi, against the variant viđišamnāiš. The word is translated etymologically, pad for the oblique case, bē / abē for vi, dahišnH as the root of the Avestan word contains dāh-. σ.m of line 1 is most probably derived from the accusative marker am / īm in words 2, 3, 4. bāgam, "most share(s)", "the most surpassing portion" (Wilkins Smith), is rendered by bār, "portion", later understood, especially in the Dēnkard versions, as "taxes". It is perhaps of interest that the viđdH grade of the Avestan word survives in the Middle Persian lemma chosen (*bāz*; not *bahr*). On other translations of the Avestan word in question cf. further; kunišn ī Ohrmazd pahlom translates the sequence šītaoθanāiš mazdā vahištəm, which was understood similarly to the analysis by Wilkins Smith ("for (his) deeds, the best thing through wisdom"), namely, mazdā was not taken as a vocative form³¹; varəšanē was translated warzišn on both etymological [pseudo-] grammatical basis (-šānē / -išn), while the phonic similarity was crucial in making this specific choice. As the Pahlavi version of line 2 has any sense at all only if we add case endings, I tend to see in the *Zand* to line 2 a survival of the genuine Late Old Iranian / Early Middle Iranian translation of the Gāthā in question. The original language might be Late Avestan, Late Old Persian or Early Middle Persian. The original version was linguistically upgraded, but to a lesser degree than other *Zands*, for an unknown reason. I prefer not to speculate whether there was a written version of at least this specific line. However, it is difficult to explain how the reasonable knowledge of the Avestan text could be achieved only from this particular version. It seems that the *Urtext* of our *Zand* was accompanied by some longer exegetical versions. One such version we find indeed in the Bag Nask version, which is stricter than the S[t]ddgaR Nask version.

28 Molé 1959, 283 n. 3 reads *u-m*.

29 Molé, ib.: "et je désire donner sa part au bon roi [je donnerai sa part à celui qu'il faut qu'il soit un bon roi]".

30 No cohesive translation of the asterisked text can be given.

31 As Humbach did, cf. the translation above; I have explained in the *Introduction* why the translation by Humbach & Ichaporia was used as the basis.

[TEXT XVIII] Warštmanšar Nask, Dk 9.44.1:

21-om fragard Vahū[k]-Xšaθr ūš guft Ohrmazd kū: "am dād Zardu[x]št hān ī weh xVadāy kāmāg" ud ēnāz kū ka xVadāy ī weh kāmāg pad bār ī gehān arzānīg [kē pad bār ī gehān arzānīg] [az bār īš dehīhēd awē gehānāz abzōn] ud [kēš az bār dahišnīh xVad gehānāz abzōn] aš bār dād wizīdār dahišn [wizīdār dahišnīh pahlom kunišn] [ud abartarīh ī kunišn az menišn gōwišn].

The 21st³² fragard Vahū[k]-Xšaθr. He, Ohrmazd, said: "I created, O Zoroaster, this desire for a good ruler". And this, too, when the good ruler is worthy of the desire for the taxes of the world [one who is worthy of the taxes of the world] [from the taxes that he is given the abundance of this world (is) also (produced)] and [one from whose taxes-giving the abundance of this world (is) also (produced) by itself] the taxes he gave (he is) giving by choice [giving by choice is the best action] [and action is superior to thought and speech].

32 "The 20th fragard" in other versions.

[TEXT XVII] The Bag Nask version is as follows (Bag Nask, Dk 9.66.1-2):

1. Wistom fragard Vahū[k]-Xšaθr ūš guft Ohrmazd ō Spitāmān Zardu[x]št kū: "kē nūn pad xVadāyīh padixšāy hēnd mardom ī sāstār druwand drōzan nē nūn pad xVadāyīh awēz ī drōzēnīd andar axV ī astōmand az šēwan bē wānēnēh ud margīh ud sēz ud drōzišn bōzēnēnd cēš nē bōzēnēnd".
2. ud ēnāz kū: "ka.šān xVadāyīh bē ō awē ī weh dād hēh bōzihast ē pad hān ī awē xVadāyīh hānāz ī drōzīnīdag az šēwan bē wānēnēh ud margīh ud sēz ud drōzišn".

The twentieth fragard Vahū[k]-Xšaθr. He, Ohrmazd, said to Spitāmān Zoroaster saying: "They are authorized who are now in power. Tyranical wicked lying people are not now in power. And you should overcome him who caused deception in the corporeal world by laments, that they are trying to excuse death and danger and deception, so that they could not to cause (these thing) to be excused".

2. And this, too: "When they will give the power to him who is good, they would be saved by his sovereignty. But him who was deceived by laments, him you should overcome, and also to do this to death and danger and deception".

[TEXT XIX] The summarized version of S(t)ūdgar Nask, as given in Dk 9.21, is as follows:

20-om fragard Vahū[k]-Xšaθr, abar stahmagthā kardan ī Dahāg-xvādāyih
 abar būm ī 7 ud peš-rawāgth īš framān az xVarrahān wardīšn.
 2. ud abar hanjamanīgān pursīšn ī Dahāg abar cim ī *bēšōmandth ī
 hambāstag mardom pas az kirrēnīdan ī Jam ud xvādāyih ī Dahāg ud mardom
 o Dahāg pāssaxv guftan kū "Jam abāz dāšt ēštād az gēhān niyāz škōhth ud
 sud ud tišn ud zarmān ud margth ud šewan ud mōy ud sarmāy ud garmāy ī a-
 paymān ud amēzišn ī dēw abāg mardom".
 3. ud ēnaz kū: "āsānīh-dādār būd Jam [kū.š ciš hān kard ī mardomān āsānīh
 azaš būd] ud kāmāg-dādār" [kū.š nēwagīh pad dād šnāyēntdārth; kū.š
 mardom pad frārōnīh ōh šnāyēntd].
 4. ud ōdag kē (Yīmšēd [ī huramag] [kē-tān pad zūr-zanīšnīh bē zad a-
 dādestānīhā] warrag³³ abar gēhān harzag³⁴ kard) niyāz ud škōhth ud
 tangīh ud āz ud sud ud tišn <ud> xēšm ī xurdrōš hēz ī awāstr³⁵ sahm ud sēz
 ī nihān-rawīšn ud zarmān ī duždaft ud haft dēw ēzišnōmand dād.
 5. ud ēnaz kū: "pusar wēnēdat bē Až a-pušt³⁶ kard duš.xVarrah [hād
 šibist³⁷ xvādakard] ī abē kard sēz [kū.š cārag xvāst nē šāyēd] kē nē wālēd
 az tan [kū paywand azaš ne rawēd].

33 Molé read here tō.

34 Molé 1959, 284; Tafazzoli 1971, 197: arzōk "desire illicite".

35 Tafazzoli 1971, 197-8: hēz, "drought"; W hyyc ī awāstar "And you have let loose into the world Want Poverty, Distress...and hyyc that has no pasture-land...". Avestan avāstarā "was kein Futter hat", used as an epithet of haēca- "Trockenheit, Dürre", Vd 13.51, 7.26, Yt 13.130, translated as hušk ī awāstar (Molé: *Av a vāstra* "qui détruit le fourrage").

36 Or: ābusīh; or: abusīh.

37 Molé: "NP répugnant"; West: "monster"; Šēbāg, "vipér", Šēbišn, "confusion".

The 20th fragard, Vahū[k]-Xšaθr, is about Dahāg's sovereignty tyrannically exercised over the earth of the seven continents and about the propagation of his rule due to vicissitude / curbing of the royal glory (xVarrah).

2. And about Dahāg's asking the people of the assembly the reason of distress of the collected people, after Yima's having been slain and Dahāg's accession to power. And how people answered to Dahāg, saying that "Yima warded off from the world need, misery, hunger and thirst, old age and death, mourning, lamentation, cold and heat when they are beyond the good measure, and intermingling of demons with men".
3. And this, too, that Yima was creator of ease [i.e., he made things by which people are at ease] and creator of will/desire [i.e., goodness through the pleasing of the law; i.e., he pleased people through righteousness/for he taught people the righteousness].
4. "And ōdag (who let loose into the world the lambs⁵⁴ of Royal Yima [of the goodly flocks], whom you struck down by a treacherous blow unjustly) established the veneration of the demons of Need and Misery, Straitness and Craving, Hunger and Thirst, Wrath of the bloody spear, Drought that has no pasture-land, Fear and Danger that moves in secret, Old Age whose breath is foul / depriving of issue (and the Seven Demons)".
5. And this, too, that they see (look for?) a son, but it is you, O Snake, that made them barren⁵⁵ (just having given birth), you, O that of Evil Destiny! [i.e., monstrous self-produced] not-completely made draught [that it is impossible to look a remedy for] who does not increase from their bodies [i.e., there is no issue proceeding].

54 After Yima's death, his flocks got dispersed. For the idea, compare, e.g., Zechariah 13.7: "Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered", hāk ʾet hārōʿe uldšely)nā haššō(ʾ)n.

55 Or: "pregnant"; or: "just having given birth".

6. ūt gōspand ī frāxv.raftār az mardomān gadag³⁸ dāred ud tō az amāh bē appurd hān ī bāmīg ī rōšn Yim ī šēd ī huramāg kē pad harwisp سيم (h'y, 'hy?39) abarrasišnih pad hamāg zamistān īš pad hutābišnih tāft [kūš gyāg pad nēwagth kardan bē mad].

7. *ōšōmand hēh⁴⁰, Bēwarāsp, tō-z bē škīh, ciyōn ēn dādistan ēdōn kū xVadāy ī wad ciš ē ī ēdōn wadl amān awē ī weh xVadāy kāmāg bahr abar barišnih [ciš ē awē dahom kē xVadāy ī weh abāyēd ka kunēd]".

8. ud abar wāntān ī Frēdōn Dahāg. margēntān.rāy wazr abar palīg⁴¹ ud dīl mastargēz zadan ud nē murdan ī Dahāg az hān zanišn. 9. ud pas pad šafšēr zadan ud pad fradom didīgar sidīgar zanišn az tan ī Dahāg was ēwēnag xrafstr waštān.

10. guftan ī Dādār ī Ohrmazd ē Frēdōn kūš mā kirrēnēh kē Dahāg cē agarēz kirrēnēh Dahāg, purr ēn zamīg kunēd az gaz udarasag gaždom ud karbūg / karbunag ud kasūg ud wazay". abāg ēwēnag ī bastan ī pad škeft band andar grāntom pātīfrāh ī *zindān.

11. ud ēnaz kē kā Aži Dahāg bast būd ēdōn hānēz sraw bē mad pad harwisp kišwar kē 7 kū: "bē zad Aži Dahāg, bē hān zad Frēdōn ī Aspīgān ī buland ī zōrfīg".

38 Cf. WZs 32.4; Arabic KDY "to beg", *kudyat* "begging, mendicity" is perhaps a loan from Iranian.

39 Tafazzoli 1974a, 120-1, saw here an Avestan transliteration; cf. also Tafazzoli 1989a, 367-8.

*səyag? West: "In on every evil contingency"; Molé: "tous les fois qu'il y avait ombre". Tafazzoli identified here several translations from Avesta: abar rasišnih-aiwi gati. 'ys ēs/Is Av.*isu/ aesu "frost". cf. aēxa->NPrs yax, "ice"; "to freeze", Vd.9.6: Zamō Isaoš aiwi.gaitīm, "on the arrival of the cold winter" = Zamistān [I] snēhōmand.

40 West 1892, 214, translated: "Thou art intelligent, O Bēwarāsp! do thou even tell how this opinion is so, that a bad ruler is a thing which is so bad ..." etc.; Molé 1959, 287, translated: "Tu mérites la mort, ô Bēwarāsp, péris donc! Car c'est une règle qu'un mauvais souverain mérite une chose aussi mauvaise. C'est un bon souverain que nous désiront, nous lui donnerons sa part (nous donnerons des choses à celui qui exercera la royauté comme il faut)". The problem is with the word [h]ōšōmand, which means both "mortal" and "intelligent". Cf. also Dādistan ī Dēnīg 72.3, further, and my note there. As we know that Aži Dahāka was not destroyed by Frēdōn, and the verb used after the problematic [h]ōšōmand is bē škīh, we rather have to suggest the meaning "mortal".

41 Cf. Henning 1946, 729.

6. You rob from men their wide-going sheep and you (Aži Dahāg) have deprived us of brilliant and bright Royal Yima of goodly flocks, who, at every approach of h'y / 'hy during the whole winter, shone with his good heat [i.e., he came to places in order to do good].

7. "Whither away, O Bēwarāsp, and be also broken, according to the law that a bad ruler deserves things as bad as he is! We desire a good ruler to bring him our portion (taxes) [I will give something to him who will exercise the Good Rule as it should be]".

8. And about vanquishing of Dahāg by Frēdōn, wishing to destroy him with blows of the club on the nape of the neck, on his chest, on his skull, too, (but) Dahāg did not die from those blows.

9. Then he smote him with (his) sword, and on the first, on the second, and on the third blow, many kinds of noxious creatures were bursting like a rain / turning out⁵⁶.

10. (About) the speech of the Creator Ohrmazd to Frēdōn, saying: "Do not saw⁵⁷ him who is Dahāg, because if you do saw Dahāg, he will make the earth full of serpents (gaz), *otters (udasasag), scorpions (gaždom), lizards (karbūg/karbunag), tortoises (kasūg) and frogs (wazay)". (And about) the mode of binding him with awful fetters in the most severe punishment of imprisonment.

11. And this, too, that when Aži Dahāg was bound, this tiding came throughout all the seven continents, namely: "Smitten at once is Aži Dahāg, smote him at once Frēdōn the Aspīgān⁵⁸, the exalted and mighty"⁵⁹.

56 A slightly different translation in Williams 1990, II, 223.

57 However, Frēdōn transgressed the command of Ohrmazd, cf. PRDD 47.9 (Williams 1990, I, 170-1, II, 78): ūš Frēdōn hāxt awēz Ohrmazd tar menīd ūš pad hān tar menīšnih əš Zarmān abar dbast ūš tan ī xwēšəz pad kudēnag tuwān būd dāštən əzəš sē gām tāš pērāmōn hamē petīt hēnd, "and he [Ohrmazd] instructed Frēdōr (but) he also despised Ohrmazd, and for that contempt of his, Zarmān then fell upon him, and with a mallet (?) he was able to keep his body three paces from him until those around him repented".

58 Aōwyāna, from Aōwya, who, according to Yas. 9.7, was the father of Thrētaona, Frēdōr; but Bd 31.4,7,8, 32.1, make it a family name for many preceding generations.

59 The passage can be translated also as: "And this, too, that when Aži Dahāg was bound, this message came throughout all the seven continents, namely: "Aži Dahāg is smitten, but he (Aži Dahāg) had also smitten Frēdōn the Aspīgān, the exalted and mighty".

12. ud hān dahom zamistān hān-mādagān⁴² wurrōyist ūšān ēdōn guft kū:
 "mēmēm az Yim nūn kūšān zad Aži Dahāg cē nē nūn wazēd abar ō harwisp
 kišwar kē 7 hān t weh gōwišn ud hān t wattar az nē gōwed ud nē pad
 xVāhišn xVāhed hān t nēwag carādīg ud hānaz t arzōg t xVāstāg".

13. ēnaz kū: "kāš zan ud xVāstāg tš abāyīšnīg sahist dāštān āgāhīh mad,
 ēgaz pad sūrāgōmand t zarrēn andar āhixt ud hān bandag ēraxt⁴³ pad mēnōg
 gyāgīh ō gristag bē mad t Aži Dahāg".

14. ud ēnaz kū kēš hān t awē bē zad brād ayāb nāf ayāb pid [t] ayab kadārcē
 nābanazdištān⁴⁴ ēšān nē pad hān t grān sahist ūšān nē pad menišn menīd
 kūšān ayādaz abāz nē kard ūšān ēdōn guft kū: "mānbēd hān bē zad kē
 harwisp āta(x)šān kē dēwān⁴⁵ abāyēd hān mānbēd. dahyūpat hān bē zad kē
 harwistīn awēšān xVādāy".

15. ud ēnaz kū: har gyāg kū awē bē mad asp az sēj andar ōpast
 ūšān hān t stabr āta(x)š asptan⁴⁶ pahrez rāy".

16. ud ēnaz kūš pad gumēzag warzīd ud hānaz t dušhuwaršt Aži Dahāg.

42 West: "Those particulars were believed"; Molé's unmarked emendation dehān, "lands", is not necessary.

43 ēraxtan, "condemn, make guilt, blame, damn"; ērang also means "error, heresy", cf. Dk 9.32.8; the word is known as an Old Persian loan in Egyptian Aramaic ארנג "guarantor"; cf. also Perikhanian 1973, 469ff.; Sogdian (Martin Schwartz quoted in Porten & Greenfield 1969) ptžnq, ptž'nhk, "earnest money"; cf. also Shaked 1975, 216ff.: the Middle Persian pair ēraxt and buxt is semantically similar to Hebrew וְכִפֹּת and וְכִפֹּת אֵי, and especially to Syriac ܕܠܚܝܬܐ and ܕܠܚܝܬܐ, with their additional meanings of "vanquished" and "victor". The Judaeo-Persian ܕܠܚܝܬܐ and ܕܠܚܝܬܐ translate Hebrew וְכִפֹּת, "evil, sin", or וְכִפֹּת, "guilt".

44 Molé's reading: "quelque parent que ce soit", after West's "any one whatever of his nearest relations". I doubt the reading, however, I accept it and the translations, as I have none better of my own.

45 The text has az Dēn ē; emended with Molé.

46 I read thus with West; Molé read *dseft, translating "et on y allumait"; my reading is based on assumption that we have here probably an import from a lost Pahlavi version of Yt 8.20ff. and Dahāg was assimilated into Apaoša.

12. And in the tenth winter (year), these females (finally) believed, and thus they said: "We think that they smote Aži Dahāg because of Yima, because he do not fly now above all the seven continents. This is a good

talk! And this the worst aš (dragon/serpent) does not talk, nor demands invocations (to him), (or) the virtuous maiden, or even desirable wealth⁶⁰.

13. This, too, that, when he learned about a woman, or property, that seemed to him desirable to possess, and he took over of this bound one[s], drew them by means of a golden *sufra*, and that, bound and destined, came at once by a spirit to the den of Aži Dahāg⁶¹.

14. And this, too, that, though he who smote him were his brother, or relation, or father, or any one whatever of his nearest relations, it did not seem to them severe, and they not thought in their minds, i.e., they even did not remembered (of it), and thus they said: "That one who has smitten (him) is a mānbēd (householder), this mānbēd (is) one for whom all the fires of the dēws are suitable. A ruler is this who smote, who is lord of all of them.

15. And this, too, that everywhere he (Dahāg) came, horses fell from plague and they (are) these strong fires for their (horses') protection.

16. And this, too, that he (Dahāg) acted in a mixed way and this is also the evil deed⁶² of Aži Dahāg.

60 As to the translation of the Pahlavi xVāstāg, it is worth notice that in Classical Georgian, *xuastagi*, borrowed from Iranian, means both "wealth" and "cattle".

61 I think it is possible to translate also: "he blew in his sūrāgōmand". Compare Tafazzoli 1977/1535h.š, who translated: tñ nīz kīh čūn be ū āgāhī mī rasīd kīh be našar mī rasad kīh kasī zan o xVāstah t šālistah ē dārad, way (Qahhāk) urā bā "sūrāgōmand" t zarrīn (be sōy t xVād) dar mī kaštīd, ān bandah rā mahkūm mī kard, be jāy t panhānī, be lānah ē (xVāš) mī āmad.

62 Though dušhuwaršt, "bad good deed, benevolent mis-deed", is not a rare term, it seems that in this context it has a specific meaning connected to the strange expression, "maleficent benevolence", used in the Armenian version of [pseudo-] Xorēnac'i. Cf. further.

17. ud abar hampursīdan ī Māzandarān dehān pas az wānīdan ī Dahāg pad dāštan⁴⁷ ī ō XvanTrah ud spōxtan ī Frēdōn azāš pad mānišn frāz kardan ī ham gyāg pad was marag padīd. ūšān bulandīh rāy zrēh ī Frāxvkard hast kū tā miyān rān hast kū tā nārag ud hān ī zuftar gyāg tā ō dahān maq.

18. ud kā ō ēn kišwar mad hēnd dīyūšān grān ziyān zanišn kardan, mardomān pad garzišn ō Frēdōn madan ud guftan kū: "cimāt bē zad Aži Dahāg kē hux^vadāy būd pad padixšāyīh kūš bīm abāz dāšt ud wīzōstār⁴⁸ ūš ēn kišwar bē pād az Māzandarān dehān?".

19. ūšān abar wattarīh ī Māzandarān ud x^vārgōnīh ī mardom ī ēn kišwar andar awēšān ēnāz guft kū; ēg gōwēnd kū: "cē. ēdōn awēšān dādestān, cē dōzōmand [kūšān kalak⁴⁹ hast], sūlāxōmand [kūšān sūlāx hast] *did⁵⁰ x^vānišnōmand [kū ēwag awē ī did ī awē x^vānēnd] wīr amāh awēšānāz menēm (pad ēd dārem kū mardom hēnd".

47 West: "turning to", gāštan.

48 Cf. Gignoux 1991a, 21: pad yazdān wīzōhērīh, "pour l'examen de dieux", on Māhān's seal; cf. MacKenzie 1971, 92.

49 According to Monchi-Zadeh 1975, whose clue to the passage was the New Persian dōz u kalak; if one reads karak, then the word must represent Avestan *karan* -; AiW to *karan* notes that the Pahlavi rendering of Yt 11.2 is "undeutlich"; Kreyenbroek 1984, 58, read **wkklkrn*. Cf. also Kreyenbroek 1984, 98.

50 The conjecture is by Monchi-Zadeh.

17. And about the consultation taken by the Māzandarān countries after the victory over Dahāg about taking possession of XvanTrah, and driving out Frēdōn therefrom and turning the whole place into dwelling [for themselves], by means of appearing⁶³ in great numbers. And because of their tallness, the [waters] of the sea Frāxvkard⁶⁴ came up, in some places, to their hips, in some places, or to their navels, and in the deeper places up to their mouths.

18. And (about) their producing much harm (and) smiting the [righteous] poor, when they had arrived to that Continent, and (about) people's coming complaining to Frēdōn, saying to him: "Why did you smite Aži Dahāg, who was a good ruler through sovereignty, who kept away fear and whose person in charge⁶⁵ protected this region from those [inhabitants] of the Māzandarān countries?".

19.⁶⁶ And they also said about the vileness of those [inhabitants] of the Māzandarān and about their scorn⁶⁷ towards the people of this region⁶⁸; then they say, too: "What for a law! What for cunning (people)! [that is, they are mischievous], they have holes⁶⁹ [that is, their holes are (**daevic*)], they are *miscallers⁷⁰ [that is, they call one (thing) with another⁷¹ (name)] - (should) we believe they are men, too?! [(should) we consider them human?]."

63 Or, "falling". The latter meaning is suggestive because of the semantic connections existing between "giants" and "to fall".

64 The ocean Vourukaša was divided into three salt seas: Pūdtig / Pūdtika, "cleansing", the Persian Gulf; Syāwbūm, the Black Sea [cf. Boyce 1975b, 145; cf. now also Cereti 1997, 19, who refers to Boyce; however, Frejman 1930 demonstrated, convincingly that the Pahlavi name of the Black Sea should be read *[a]xšīn; Kamrōd, the Caspian Sea; cf. WZs 3.17ff., GrBd 10.7-8.

65 "Examiner, Inquisitor, one who looks after". Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 102: "geschickt (vičustār)". The word is attested on glyptic articles (Gignoux 1991a, 21): pad Yazdān wīzōh [wyz'wh] ērīh, "par l'examen de dieu".

66 This is the most problematic passage in the whole chapter; after having inveted much time and thought trying to understand it, I came to conclusion that most of the readings and emendations made by Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 102-3, must be accepted.

67 Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 102: "Fressen [der Menschen]".

68 Here a direct Avestan quotation, abundant in *daevic* terms, is introduced. The speakers are the people complaining about the invasion of the Māzandarānis.

69 West 1892, 217 n.1: "Burrows, caves, and similiae underground habitations are probably meant". Molé rendered "des trous", implying a *daevic* word for "eyes". Another option is to suggest that the Avestan, or the Pahlavi, text was probably corrupt: *zafar*, "*daevic* mouth", is close in sound to the postulated (compare Hom 1893, 166 N^o 754) source of the Persian *sūrāx*, namely, **sufrā*, and it was thus **zafar* that stood in the Avestan original. *zafar* appears also in the already quoted Yt 11.2, which has, moreover, some other common points with Dk 9.21. The other possibility is an import from the beginning of the Dk chapter.

70 *x^vāstan* etc. stand for Avestan *zavan*, "Ruf", and *zav*, "rufen", cf. AiW 1667; these are connected to *zafar*, cf. the previous note.

71 Not translated by Molé.

20. ud abar rasišnīh ī Frēdōn abāg Māzandarān dehān pad dašt ī Pēšansēh
[ī] paykārdan ī ō awēšān kū: "Māzandar dehat, az bē zad Aži Dahāg kē stī
arwandtom kē har *2-ān pādixšāy būd dēwān mardomān azēš pad hān ī awē
zanišn frāz dād hom Ōhrmazd tarwēnīdārtar az hān hangāmān pad hamēmār
ī xvēš stōw kardan. ēg ēn hān ī man deh bē zanēd, šmāh kē Māzandar
deh.ēd!".

21. ud Māzandarān Frēdōn sabōg menīd ud pad aršōs ēwāz guft kū: "ēdōn ē
bawēd kū tō bē zad Aži Dahāg kē stī arwandtom kē har 2-ān pādixšāy būd
dēwān mardomān. ūš tō pad hān ī awē zanišn frāz dād hēh Ōhrmazd
tarwēnīdārtar az hān hangāmān. ēgaz amāh ēn nišīnēm ud andar ēn mānēm
ud nē tō ī buland ī was arōyišn ī *stār payag⁵¹ ud wēr gōwišn andar abārīg
kasat ēdar bē nē hīlēm!".

22. ēnaz kū bē pas tazīd ud pērozgar Frēdōn ō bālist ī pēš tazīd ūš wēnīg
hān frawīd⁵² [kūš bē daft] az dašn wēnīg ī awē snēxr padīd hēnd ī hamāg
sard ī zamīstān.ōšīšn ī burrag ī tēz. ud az hōy wēnīg ī awē sa[n]g⁵³ padīd
hēnd kā daft ī kadag.masāy ī āta[x]š.ōšīšn ī burrag ī tēz. xākāš burd bē
bast pērozgar ī tagīg ī Frēdōn az pād ī gāw ī gušn ī Barmāyūn.

20⁷². About the arrival of Frēdōn to combat with those [inhabitants] of the Māzandarān
country on the plain of Pēšansēh⁷³: "O you (of the) Māzandar country, I have destroyed Aži
Dahāg who was the most valiant being⁷⁴, him who was a sovereign of both demons and men; I am
created by Ōhrmazd for that smiting as the most victorious of this age, that I might defeat my
opponent! Then (now) you smite this country of mine, you who are of the Māzandar country!".

21. And the Māzandarānis despised Frēdōn, and mocked saying: "Let it be so, that you have
destroyed Aži Dahāg, who was the most valiant being, him who was a sovereign of both demons
and men; for that smiting you are created by Ōhrmazd as the most victorious of this age, [but]
even then we will settle at this place and will stay at this place; and we will not
let you here, you, the lofty one, well-grown, ranked among stars, exceedingly speaking among
other people!".

22. This, too, that nevertheless they afterwards fled back, and the victorious Frēdōn chased them
to the upland, and his nostrils flamed [*i.e.*, he exhaled]; from his right nostril snows fell,
murderous like all the cold of the winter, cutting and sharp; and from his left nostril, when he
exhaled, fell rocks, the size of a house, murderous like fire, cutting and sharp. The victorious
and swift Frēdōn **leveled them, bound them to the feet of the male ox Barmāyūn*⁷⁵.

⁵¹ I accept the emendation made in Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 104 n. 8.

⁵² Cf. Yn 9.32 *frāz frawēd-frāfravaitē*.

⁵³ MP *sag*, "stone", DkM 814.9, cmp. Frah.Olm 25a (1.17), cf. Tafazzoli 1974b, 342.

⁷² The appearance of warrior's boasting pieces in §§ 20-21, which no doubt go to an Avestan text, might suggest an Avestan origin of similar warrior's boasting passages in AyZ.

⁷³ Cf. Dk 9.16.17.

⁷⁴ Or, "among beings".

⁷⁵ This appears to be the name of a brother of Frēdōn (see Bd 31.5). Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 105 (and n. 14) emended the text: "F. brächte einen *Wagen [awiš ra]hly burd und band (ihn) hinter den Stier B.".

23. ũš hān pad uīth uī dawēnīd ũš awēšān kard sa[n]g karb. ũš awēšān bē zad hēnd kē Māzandarān deh pad 50-ganišnīh ud 100-ganišnīh ud 1000-ganišnīh ud bēwar-ganišnīh ud amar-ganišnīh.

24. ũš ēdōn bē zad hēnd pērōzgar ī tagīg Frēdōn 2 srišwadag <ī> hān ī Māzandar deh, ud ēwag srišwadag bē mad zad ud wēmār, ud nēz pas, Spitāmān Zardu(x)št, kē Māzandar deh abar ēn kišwar ī Xwanīrah raft hēnd, ũšān nē pad abar.menišnīhaz mēnīd kū: "Šawēm" bē az hān kē ēdōn nām būd hēnd Spītyōš ī Spānsnāyōš ud Arezrāspāh ī Spānsnāyōš kē tazīd hēnd pad xrad xVāyīšnīh ud raft hēnd abar Frašōštr ī HVōwān.

25. Pahlom ābādīh hast ahlāyīh.

23. And he rushed⁷⁶ up on the ascent, and he made them figures of stone⁷⁷, and he smote them who are [inhabitants] of the Māzandar country, by fifties, by hundreds, by thousands, by myriads, and by innumerable⁷⁸.

24. Two-thirds of those [inhabitants] of the Māzandar country were thus destroyed by the victorious and swift Frēdōn, and one-third came out beaten and sick; and never afterwards, O Spitāmān Zoroaster! have they, who are [inhabitants] of the Māzandar country, went upon this Continent of Xv anīrah, and and they did not think haughty: "Let us march!", except those whose names were thus, Spītyōš⁷⁹ son of Spānsnāyōš, and Arezrāspāh⁸⁰, son of Spānsnāyōš⁸¹, who have rushed in search of wisdom and went unto Frašōštar⁸² of the clan of HVōwas⁸³.

25. Perfect excellence is righteousness.

⁷⁶ Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 105: "trieb".

⁷⁷ The reading of Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 105 (and n. 15): "er warf ihnen Steine auf die Leiber", seems to me unacceptable. Besides, turning one into stone is typical for the Frēdōn-cycle.

⁷⁸ Compare Yt. 5, 54, 58, 117; PhIVd 7, 137, 139.

⁷⁹ Spitī, AIW 1624, a shortened form of *Spītyaspa, according to Monchi-Zadeh 1975, 107.

⁸⁰ Arezrāspa-.

⁸¹ These two sons of Spānsnāyōš / Uspānu- were the spiritual (*ratu*) chiefs of the two northern Continents, Fradaōrēš and Vīdaōrēš, cf. Bd 29.2. Their countries must thus have been identified with Māzandarān. The names are derived from Yt 13.121, where the *fravaš*is of both are said to be revered.

⁸² See Dk 9.38.68.

⁸³ Avestan HVōva, the family name of Frašōštar, Jāmāsp, and several other persons.

[TEXT XX] Yt 9.5:

pancadasa fracarōiθe pita puθrasca raōdæšva katarasciṭ yavata
xšayōiṭ⁸⁴ hvāθwō yimō vīvaṇuhatō puθrō,

to which the Middle Persian version is as follows:

pad hān ī Yim xVadāyīh ī aurwand nē sarmā[k] būd ud nē garmā[k] nē
zarmān būd ud nē margīh ud nē arišk ī dēwān.dād [hād hamāg būdan bē az
wināh abāz dāšt ēštād hēnd] 15-sāl arōyišn frāz raft hēnd pīdar ud pus
kadārēz [hād Burzōg pad stāyišn ī pūsar guft pus ēdōn nēwag būd ciyōn
pīdar ud pīdar ēdōn nēwag bud ciyōn pus] hamē tā ka padixšāy būd huramag
Yim ī šēd Vīvāghān pus [ēn ciš ēdōn būd],

In the kingship of the brave Yima there was no (excessive) cold and no heat, no old age and no
death, and no envy created by demons [*i.e.*, the whole being were held in check from the sin] 15
years-grown walked together [Burzōg said it in praise of the son, namely: "the son was as
brave as his father, and the father was as brave as his son"] all of them, as long as ruled Yima
son of Vīvāhvant-, of the goodly flocks, the bright [it was this way].

⁸⁴ nōiṭ aotēm ānha ... yavata xšayōiṭ ... Yimō, "there was no excessive cold ... as long Yima
ruled", cf. Dresden 1970, 136ff., where the optative character of the verbal form is established.

[TEXT XXI]

WZs 32.2-485:

ciyōn Yim abāz dārišnīh ī sahm ud tangīh ud sēz rāy rawān ī awē yazīhēd
ud xVānīhēd pad abāz ēstišnīh [ī] dēwān frāz kirrēnīd hēzaz [ī] awāstar
sahm ud sēzaz ī nihān rawīšn.

ēdōnēz Frēdōn bastan ī Aži Dahāg rāy, xVānīhēd pad abāz ēstišnīh ī
Až.kirdārān bēš.

ēdōnēz Geršāsp zadan ī rah.dārān ud gadagān⁸⁶ ud sēzān rāy, xVānīhēd pad
abāz ēstišnīh ī gadag.kirdārān bēš.

Thus because Jam held Fear, Distress and Danger in check, his soul is worshipped and invoked
in order to repel the (calamities) created by the demons, viz., Drought that has no pasture-land,
Fear and Danger that moves in secret. So also because Frēdōn bound Aži Dahāg, he is invoked
to repel the violence of those who behave like Aži Dahāg. And because Geršāsp smote down
highwaymen and robbers, he is invoked to repel the violence of those who behave like robbers.

[TEXT XXII]

Yt (Frawardēn Yašt) 13.130:

yimahe vīvāghanahe ašaonō frauuašīm yazamaide sūrahe vōru.vāθwō
frakarštaliā⁸⁵ haēcaṇhasca auuāstrahe iθiajaṇhasca maršāonahe,

We worship the frauuaši of Yima son of Vīvāhvant-, the strong, having flocks at his
wish, to stand against Drought that has no pasture-land and Death that creeps unseen.

frāz kirrēnīd in [TEXT XXI] translates [oddly] frakarštaliā⁸⁵, hēzaz ī awāstar
stands for haēcaṇhasca auuāstrahe⁸⁷, while iθiajaṇhasca
maršāonahe is rendered by sēzaz ī nihān rawīšn⁸⁸.

⁸⁵ Cf. Zaehner 1955, 259, 263; Molé 1963, 107; Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 114-5, 172-3.

⁸⁶ Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993: gēgān. Cf. Dk 9.21.6, further.

⁸⁷ Cf. Tafazzoli 1971, 197: hēz, "drought", DkM 810.20-21; Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 173.
Otherwise translated as hušk ī awāstar, cf. Tafazzoli 1971, *ibid*.

⁸⁸ Cf. AiW 799; Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 173.

[TEXT XXIII] Yt 19.34:

daē yat hīm aēm draoyām vācīm anghalōīm cinmāne paiti.barata
vaēnəmnam ahmaē haca x^Varəno merəyahe kahrpa frašusaē auuaēno x^Varəno
fraēštō yō yimō xšaštō huuaēbō brasaē yimō ašatō dōuš.manahitāica hō
stəratō nidāraē upairi.zam,

Then when he (Yima) acquired this lying false word, the x^Varana- departed him visibly in
the form of a bird. Not seeing the x^Varana-, the Royal Yima of goodly flocks moved around,
wandered in distress, became stunned because of his disordered state of mind and concealed
himself on the earth.

[TEXT XXIV] Bd 35.10:

Az Aspiyān ī Pūrgāw Frēdōn zād kē kēn ī Yim x^Vast. hānəz frazand
Bārmāyūn ud Kadāyūn, Frēdōn az awēšān purr.x^Varraha tar būd,

Frēdōn was born from Aspiyān ī Pūrgāw, him who sought revenge for Yima; other his
(Aspiyān ī Pūrgāw) children were Bārmāyūn and Kadāyūn, (but) Frēdōn was endowed
with x^Varraha more than those (two brothers).

[TEXT XXV] Pvd 10.9-10:

...bē purdīnam indr [dēw], bē purdīnam Saurv [dēw], bē purdīnam
Naoghaēi [dēw] az mān, az wēs, az zand, az deh. bē purdīnam Tarič [dēw],
bē purdīnam Zarič [dēw] az mān, az wēs, az zand, az deh.

Let me overpass the demon Indra, let me overpass the demon Saurva, let me overpass the
demon Naoghaēi from the house, from the village, from the tribe, from the country. Let me
overpass the demon Tarič, let me overpass the demon Zarič, from the village, from the tribe,
from the country.

[TEXT XXVI] Vd 19.6:

passax^V ō awē guft duž.dānag⁸⁹ Gannag Mēnōg kū: "mā ēn ī man dām
marn]ēnē, ahlaw Zardu[x]št, tō hē Pōrūšāsp pus ūt az burdār [mādar] az
Zavišān" [ēd šnāsomət] [hast kē ēdōn gōwēd ēd "nayāgānəz tō hān yašt hom
ūm tō.z hān yazl"] "abaz stāy weh Dēn ī Mazdēsnaēn, windē hān nēwagīh
ciyōnag windōd Wādayān⁹⁰ dahyupat".

The Stinking Spirit, possessor of evil wisdom⁹¹, told him, saying: "Do not destroy that
creation of mine, O righteous Zoroaster, you who are son of Pourušāspa-, you are from (her)
womb [mother], from the Zaviš-clan" [i.e., I know you] [there is someone who says that "Your
ancestors also worshiped me, so worship me you too!"]. "Scorn the Good Mazdayasnian Religion
and obtain this wealth which Wādayān dahyupat has obtained!"

89 MSS have duž.dānag. Instead of *duž.dāmānag, translating duždāmō.

90 The reading is according to Anklesaria 1949, 374 (obviously, extracted from the Avestan form).
The form and the variants found in the older Avestan-Pahlavi edition of Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp 1907,
612, are unreadable.

91 Of evil creation.

[TEXT XXVII] DD⁹² 72.1-9:

1. 71-om pursišn passax^v. hān ī pursīd kū: "grāy wināhīhā ī kunmarz kardan cē hast?. awē kē kunmarz kunēd ēzišn abāyēd framūdan kardan kē kunēd ayābēš padīš kunēd a-xvāh ham.nišastagīh ud ham.xvārišnīh ud abāg abāyēd kardan ayāb nē?".

2. passax^v ēd kū: "duš-mazdēsnān 7 bazakkar ī grāy wināh kē.šān Ahriman-warzišn nazdikaš ō Ahriman bawēnd, ū.šān 2 hān ī guft estēd kē pad ham.wināh ālōd.

3. cē hān 7 bazakkar ēwag Aži Dahāg kē.š fradom jādūgīh stāyīd, ū.š hān ī duš.padixšayīhā xvādāyīh kard ū.š a.hōšān⁹³ gyān xvāst ō gēhān.

4. ēwag Aži Srōbar kē.š ... rāh dārāy rāh-wēmag-bēdārīh ud asp ud mard ēbārīh kard.

5. ēwag Wadag ī Dahāg mādar kē.š fradom rōspīgīh kard ū.š wisptōhmagīh āsuft, a-framānīh bōšīd⁹⁴, ū.š a-dastūr ī šōy abāg pus pus hamēn.mēzišn bawēd.

6. ēwag Wiyaftag nar ōmarzišn kē.š a-kārišnīhā xvāst ī mardan ū.š fradom nar ōmarzišn ud rāh ī zahag.marnjēnišnīh bē ō narān nimūd.

7. ēwag Wiyabēnīdag, nar kē.š fradom andar nar xazdag⁹⁵ mādag.kār āwurd ū.š dōxt⁹⁶ ud hān ī zahag frawardār mādagān spar ud hān ī zahag marnjēnāg gandišn pad muhragān⁹⁷ awiš rēzišnīh ō narān *abespārdan pad dēwānīg warzišnīg kār ī apparag, rīyānīh ī zīwandagān.tōhm ahanjēd nihānīnēd.

92 Translated in West 1882 [SBE XVIII, 1-276], 216; some passages of DD and the Rivayats were extracted by de Menasce 1964 (reviewed by Gignoux, RHR 117.172, 243-4); cf. Shaki 1993b; unfortunately, Anklesaria 1958 was unavailable to me. I quote from K 35 fol.183v.

93 West 1882, 217, read *ahangān khayā*, translating *a life of the unintellectual*.

94 bōšīdan, like pōšīdan.

95 A word for "copulation" or "sexual organ / anus" is required. West: "errors of the male". Another possibility is *azdag*, "genus, race".

96 West took the word as a verb, translating "despised". I expect here a verb with some sexual connotation, and both "to sew" and "to milk" (both *dōxtan* in Middle and New Persian) do have such semantics in several languages (compare, e.g., the vernacular American "to milk up"). Otherwise, the word is to be read *dōxt* and modifies *mādag.kār*... *dōxt*.

97 On this word cf. Schwartz 1985a, 488; vrs the reading of West 1882, 218 n. 2

1. The 71st question and its answer that which you asked: "What is the grave sin of committing sodomy?. Is it proper to order and to perform a sacred ceremony [after his death] for him who commits sodomy or for him who was sodomized unwillingly, and is it proper to sit and eat together with him or not?".

2. The answer is that "Of the evil Mazdayasnians, who were seven sinners of the grave sin, who were close to Ahriman in their Ahrimanic practice, two you have mentioned, defiled with mutual sin.

3. For from these seven sinners one is Aži Dahāg, who was first to praise witchcraft; he exercised sovereignty by means of misrule and he also desired for the world?unintellectual?⁹⁸ life.

4. One is Aži Srōbar, who ... held the way through frightful watch and devoured horses and people.

5. One is Wadag mother of Dahāg, who was the first one to commit adultery, and by whom all the lineages were distorted, and who put on lack of (royal) command, and the intermingling of sons occurs without the authority of the husband.

6. One is Wiyaftag: the intercourse of males, who desired humans / men without fecundity and who was the first to demonstrate to men the intercourse of males and the way of destroying the offspring,

7.⁹⁹ One is Wiyabēnīdag, who was the first to introduce the "women-like practice / work" among the male race¹⁰⁰ and he milked up / copulated¹⁰¹ and (you) who cherished the offspring: "deliver it to females!"¹⁰², and (you) who are a destroyer of offspring, the stench flowing to the ditches is entrusting it to men by a demonical work of a robber, a defecation of the seed of living beings (commits one who) extracts and makes buried¹⁰³.

98 I follow here, with reservation, the translation made by West. Maybe, *immortal*? Dahāg's quest for immortality for all men could made the Renovation impossible, as explained in ZWY 3.

99 Many points in my translation of this passage are provisional.

100 Or: *into the men's ???*

101 Or: *the first to introduce the "women-and-daughters-like practice / work"*.

102 Or: *"trample females!"*, with the same sense.

103 West: *which effaces and conceals*. Obviously, terms for sexual practices not authorized by Zoroastrianism.

8. ēwag īūr ī Brādroxš ī karap ī duž.dēn kaydag kēš hān ī pahlom az mardomān margīnīd.

9. ēwag hān ī kēš ahlamōy dēnīhā kāmīst ō dād ī stūd ī ahlaw pad frēftārīh ī wardēnīdan Abestāg ud Zand kē xʷēš gōwēnd ...

8. One is Tūr ī Brādroxš the karap, the wizard of evil faith, who exterminated the best of people.

9. One is that who preferred the heretical religions to the Law praised by the Righteous One, by deceit of perverting the Avesta and Zand which they call their own...".

[TEXT XXVIII] DD 78.1-2 (K 35 fol.187r):

1. 77-om pūrsīšn passaxʷ. hān ī pūrsīd kū: "grāyThā wināhīhā ī rōspīg.bāragīh¹⁰⁴ kardan cīyōnīh gētīgThā tōzišn pad Dēn paydāg ēwēn mān tōzišn ēwag awīš frāmāyēd nīmōdan?"

2. passaxʷ ēd kū rōspīg.bāragīh grāy abārōn hast. fradom Dahāg kard, āšnāg pad abārōn gumēzišnīh īš kāmāg abāg Wadag ī mādar andar zīndagīh ī Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp īš pīdar a-dastūr ī Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp kēš šōy būd Wadag kēš xʷēš a-sturThā a-dādīstānīhā wināh warzišnīh grāy abēr was.

1. The 77th question and its answer that which you asked: "In regard of grave sinfulness of adultery, and its retribution, which is specified in Revelation, will you point out the modes of punishment?"¹⁰⁵.

2. The answer is the adultery is a grave vice. It was first performed by Dahāg, renown through his sinful desire of intercourse with Wadag his mother during the life-time of his father Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp¹⁰⁶ without the authority of Xrutāsp/Aurvadāsp, who was the husband of Wadag, who herself used to commit grave sin[s] very much, without being authorized by the "trustee" and illegally.

¹⁰⁴ It is worthy noting that this expression survives in the archaic Judeo-Persian of Qissa-ye Daniel as rwspyb'rky.

¹⁰⁵ Translated in Shaki 1993b, 553.

¹⁰⁶ For the reading, cmp. West 1882, 228 n. 3.

[TEXT XXIX] DD 73.1-2 (K 35 fol.184 ff.):

1. 72-om pursiṣn passax^v. hān ī pursīd: "ka.š hān kē kunmarz kunēd gand bē o āsmān šawēd ayāb nē?. ud hān gand ayāb šawēd cē gyāg šawēd?".
2. passax^v ēn kū gētiḡayīg gand and šawēd cand paymānag ī rēmanāš ud gandāš ī andar *gand.ax^vān hast. ud mēnōḡīg gand o ānōn šawēd kō gand ayābiṣnīh sāmān hast petyāragōmand gyāg.

1. The 72nd question and its answer, that which you asked: "Does the stench of a "sodomite" rise to the sky or not? And, if it does, where it goes to?"
2. The answer is this that the material stench goes as much as the proportion of his filth and his stench which are in stinking existences. And the spiritual stench goes there where there is boundary for acquiring the stench, a miserable place.

[TEXT XXX] Dk 8.35.13:

abar abārōn kāmāḡīh ī wiyaftag ud wiyabēnīdag ū.šān stahm.waranīh, ud grāy kārīh ud zad.x^varr.kirbag ud rēman tan, meh padašān gyān.zadārīh ī cišān ī wēnēnd ud acār har mehīh arzānīg margīh wirāyēd. mas ī pad wināh.kārīh ciyōn Aži Dahāg pad stahmagīh ud Srōbar gaz¹⁰⁷ pad jādōḡīh ud Tūr ī Brādroxš ī karap pad ahlaw.*kušīh frēftār ahlamōy pad drujīh.

About the vicious desire of both sorts of "sodomites" and about their violent lust and sinful work and (their) perverted virtue and filthy bodies, in which there is much destruction of life through things that they see and every greatness prepares them inevitably a deserved death. "Great in sinfulness", like Aži Dahāg, in tyranny; like the serpent Srōbar, in witchcraft; like the karap Brādroxš, in the righteous-slaughter; in falsehood, like the deceitful heretic.

107 Or. Až.

[TEXT XVII] Dk 9.10:

1. nahom fragard Yaθāiš abar dēwīh ud zad x^varrahih ud purr rēmanīh ud grān gandīh ud grān wināhih ud āzār hamāg mēnōḡīg ud gētiḡ ī nēwagīh ī kunmarz.
2. ud grān wināhih wizārdagīh ud was kirbag x^vēšēnīdārīh ī awē ī hanjīdār¹⁰⁸ ud škeft wināhih ī o šnāyēnīdār ī hān wināhkār.
3. abar 7 ī pad wadīh abar wattarīh hāwand Gannāg Mēnōḡ ošmurīd ciyōn Aži Dahāg¹⁰⁹ pad jādōḡīh ud Aži Srōbar pad stahmagīh ud Wadag pad wad hunuśakīh, Tūr ī Brādroxš pad ahlaw.kušīh ud ahlamōy pad grān wināhih ewag wiyaftag wyabēnīdag pad grān wināhih gōwēd.
4. pahlom hast ahlāyīh ābadīh.

1. The ninth fragard, Yaθāiš, is about the devilry and the blighted destiny and the complete pollution and the grave stench and the grave sinfulness, and the torment by the "sodomite" of all spiritual and worldly goodness.
2. The atonement for grave sinfulness and the appropriation of great good deeds by him who **castrates, and the awful sinfulness of him who pleases that sinner.*
3. About the seven who in [their] badness, who are accounted to be similar considering the vileness to the Stinking Spirit, such as¹¹⁰ Aži Dahaka in witchcraft, the serpent Srōbar in violence, Wadag in producing evil offspring, Tūr ī Brādroxš in slaughtering righteous [ones], and an apostate¹¹¹ in grave sinfulness: one says that "the grave sinfulness" means "passive and active pederasts".
4. Perfect is the prosperity of righteousness.

108 I take it as a dervivate from hixtan, New Persian āxtah; the stem is, however, āz, not [h]anj-. West: "molester". Is the verb used connected to the verb used in DD 72.7 (cf. there)?

109 Dk 8.13:8; 35:13, Dk 9.21:1-13, DD 72:2-9.

110 Cf. Dk 8.13. 8; 25.13, and DD 72.2-9, which last chapter contains further details regarding these seven heinous sinners, probably derived from the actual text of this ninth fragard of the S[?]ddgar Nask.

111 Ahriman or ahlamōy?

[TEXT XXXII] Bd 27.23:

ud Odag dēw hān kē ka mardom pad x^vēš.gāhīh nišēnēnd ayāb ka x^varišn
x^varēnd mēnōgīhā *paygām pan[d]īh zanēd kū: "bē drāy ud bē nigār" kū
drāyān x^varēd ud kū drāyān rīyēd ud drāyān mēzēd kū tā ō hān ī pahlom
ax^vān nē rasēd.

The demon Odag is that which, when people sit down in their toilets or when they eat their
food, she strikes them with a spiritual *message-advice, namely: "Do chatter and do off!", i.e.,
eat while chattering and defecate while chattering and urinate while chattering, so that you may
not attain the best existence.

[TEXT XXXIII] Bd 29.9:

Dahāg kē Bēwarāspēz x^vāhēnd rāy gōwēd kū Frēdōn ka.š awē bē grift pad
kuštan nē šāyēst ū.š pas pad kōf ī Dumbāwand bē bast ka harzag bawēd, Sām
āxēzēd ū.š gad zanēd ud ōzanēd,

One says of Dahāg who is also called Bēwarāsp, that when Frēdōn captured him he was
enable to kill him and he then bound him in Mt. Dumbāwand; when he shall become at loose,
Sām will arise and smite with his mace and kill him.

[TEXT XXXIV] Dk 8.13.8-9:

ud hān ī haft kišwar dušgāh dušx^vadāy Dahāg saw paywand īš abāz ō
Tōz ī Hušang brād ud tazīgān pīd, ud āgāhīh awē azāš zamānag sazišn
zamānag ī az hux^vadāyīh [ī] Yim frajām ī tā dušx^vadāyīh frajām ī Dahāg
paywand ī az Yim tā Frēdōn.

hān ī x^vānīrah x^vadāy Frēdōn ī saw pad wānīdan ī Dahāg zadan ī
Māzandarān deh ud baxtan ī x^vānīrah pad Salm ud Tōz ud Erič īš 3 pus;
paywastan īšān pad duxt ī Pātsraw ī tazīgān šāh. ud Tōz paywand ud
paywand saw ī awēšān jud jud.

An account of the ignorant, evil ruler of the seven continents Dahāg and his ancestors from
Tōz, the brother of Hušang, the (fore)father of the Arabs, and information about him and his
period, and about the passage of time from the end of the good reign of Yim until the end of the
reign of Dahāg, and the lineage of Yim until Frēdōn. An account of the conquest of Dahāg by
Frēdōn, ruler of X^vanīrah, of his smiting the province of Māzadarān and his division of
X^vanīrah between his three sons Salm and Tōz and Erič; their uniting with the daughters of
Pātsraw, king of the Arabs. The lineage of Tōz and an account of the lineage of these
separately.

[TEXT XXXV] "Day Hārōt of the Month Frawardēn" § 12-14:

māh Frawardēn rōz ī Hārōt Frēdōn baxšišn ī gēhān kard.
Hrōm ō Salm dād ud Turkistān ō Tōz dād, Erānšāhr ō Erič dād.
ud 3 duxtar ī Buxt-Xusraw ī Tazīgān šāh bē x^vast ud pad zanīh bē pusarān
dād.

On the day Hārōt of the month Frawardēn, Frēdōn divided the world. He gave Byzantium
to Salm, and Central Asia to Tōz, while the Iranian lands he gave to Erič. And he requested the
three daughters of Buxt-Xusraw the Arabian king and gave them in marriage to his sons.

[TEXT XXXVI] Dk 7.1.34 (DkM 597.19-598.3; cf. Marqwart & Messina 1931, 100; Molé 1967, 10-11, 154):

ud mad ǝ Pātsraw ī Airyafšuva ī Tāz ī Tāzīgān šāh pad Ašvahišt ī
Amahrspandān aštaḡh ūš pazdēnīd padaš az. xVēš ram Az dēw a.pāk
ham.ǝdag.

She (the xV arrah) came to Pātsraw son of Airyafšuva son of Tāz, the Arabian king,
through messengership of Ašvahišt, one of the Amahrspands, and he chased by her (the
xV arrah) from his folks (or: flocks?) the impure demon Az, the ham.ǝdag¹¹².

[TEXT XXXVII] Vd 14. 5:

baēuuare ažiṇam udarǝ.ǝrašanam auua.janliāš, baēuuare ažiṇam spakanam
kahrpunanam auua.janliāš, baēuuare kasitapanam auua.janliāš, baēuuare
wazayanam daōmainīanām auua.janliāš...

PVd 14. 5:

bēwar aži udrasag [ul srāyišn] bē zanēd [hād ul.udrasagthā ul srāyišn ǝd
kū pad iškamb dwārēd] bēwar aži sag karbūg bē zanēd [marbānag hād
sagthāš ǝd kū abāz ǝ kūn nišīnēd] bēwar kasūg bē zanēd [hād haraz kē jud
az āb tuwān zīwast nazdīg zamīg] bēwar wazay ī ābīg bē zanēd.

A myriad of *uōra*-dragons-dogs [crawling above] he shall destroy [i.e., *uōrasag* ship and
crawling above means that they daevically run on their bellies]; a myriad of dragons-dogs he
shall destroy [it is *mārbānag*¹¹³, i.e., his canine nature consists in that it sits on its
posterior]; a myriad of tortoises he shall destroy [every one of this species that can live also out
of water near the land]; a myriad of watery frogs¹¹⁴ he shall destroy....

¹¹² Molé, *ib.*: "ses congénères".

¹¹³ Zaehner, *ib.*: "protector of snakes?". *mārbānak*, according to Kapadia 1953, 419, is "a kind of
deadly poisoned snake", NP *mārmānon*, "a female serpent".

¹¹⁴ The "water rat", *ῥυποχμύς*, which Zoroastrians used to kill, according to Classic authors, is
tortoise, cf. de Jong 1996, 125-6, 235. Is it identical with *wazay ī ābīg*?

[TEXT XXXVIII] Bd 148.8-10:

*az awēšān gurg.sardagān karp<un>ag wad.tar, ciyōn gōwēd kū: "kē 4
gurg ī šēr bē ǝzanēd kirbag and bawēd cand ēwag karp<un>ag ī kūg.dumb bē
ǝzanēd".

Of the wolf-species the cat is the worst, for it is said that "to kill four lion-wolfs is as
meritorious as to kill one short-tailed cat".

[TEXT XXXIX] PVd 18.73:

ǝ hazār aži ul.gazišn¹¹⁵ bē zanēd dō hazār awēšān [mārbānag], ǝ hazār
wazay ī ābīg bē zanēd ud dō hazār hān ī ābīg.

He shall kill 1000 biting dragons and 2000 of them, he shall kill 1000 terrestrial frogs and
2000 watery frogs.

¹¹⁵ Avestan: *ažiṇam udarǝ.ǝrašanam*.

[TEXT XL] Kitābu 'l-baḍ' wa'l-ta'rīx of Muqaddasī (quoted in Tafazzoli 1977):

'Innahum qāidū: malaka 'l-'aqa'ilma 'l-sab'ata wa kāna 'amala fī maḥallatihi wa huwwa nāzilūn fīhā sab'at^{an} mašārāt likullī 'l-qilmⁱⁿ mašārāt^{an} wa hiya manfaxat^{un} min qahab^{un} fakullamā 'rāda 'an yursila saḥrahu 'ala 'l-qilm mawt^{an} aw raziya^{an} wamujā'at^{an}, nafaxa fī tilki 'l-mašārātⁱⁿ wa 'aṣāba qālika 'l-'l-qilmī min ma'irratⁱⁿ biqudri nafxihi wa kāna 'l-da ra'da fī tilki 'l-'l-qilm jāriyat^{an} hasanat^{an} aw dābbat^{an} fārihat^{an}, nafaxa fī 'l-mašārātⁱⁿ rajtarrahā 'ilayhi bisahrihi.

They said that he ruled the Seven Climes and executed his will in their places and he used to afflict harm in them by means of seven trumpets, a trumpet for each Clime, and (the trumpet) is a glden horn and whenever he wished to cast death or calamity upon a clime through his magic, he blew this trumpet and injured this Clime by blemish / curse through the force of his blowing. And it was, when he saw in that Clime a handsome maiden or some comely beast of burden, he blew the trumpet and drew to himself by his magic.

[TEXT XL] Dk 5¹¹⁶, the opening section; DkM 431ff.; DkD 338.1-10:

panjom abar gōwišn ī hufraward Adur.farrōbay ī Farraxv.zādān ī
 hudēnān.pēšobāy bōd padaz nibēg ī Simrā¹¹⁷ xvanēnd: "hangardīg passaxv ī
 Adur.farrōbay ī Farraxv.zādān ī hudēnān.pēšobāy, abar nišānagīg pursišn
 ēcand ī Ya'qōb ī Xālidān", ī ciyōnāš guft dōstīg nār¹¹⁸ *ī hamist ramān ī
 šān Simrā.z xvanēnd. kē.šān ham Ya'qōb wandīg¹¹⁹ frāz awiš rasišnīg
 abar.sardārīh ī Er.tōhmag, az šudan īšān niyāgān pad spāh.sardārīh ham
 dōstīg ud spāhīgīh ī hān ram andar spāhbedīh ī Buxt.Narsēh abar
 a.kārēnīdan ī abārōn.dādīh ud wad.kunišnīh ī Banī Srāyīl ud garān
 dēwēzagīh ud ziyān ī azešān, pad frēstīdan ī dahyupāt Kay Luhrāsp¹²⁰ az
 Erān.Sahr abāg Buxt.Narsēh ō Hrōm Baytā¹²¹ Maqdis ud hān kustag.mānīšn.

¹¹⁶ West 1897 (PT V, SBE XLVII) 119ff.; de Menasce 1958b, 29-36; Molé 1967, 106ff.; Nyberg 1964. The readings presented here are of a rather synthetic character.

¹¹⁷ West 1897, 119 n.2: Gyémard; de Menasce 1958 and Molé 1967: Dēmīā; Nyberg 1964: Simrā. Although I adopt Nyberg's reading dealt with already by West in the end of the same note, p. 120, West's understanding of the word as the Jewish Gemara seems to me preferable.

¹¹⁸ The reading adopted here is that of de Menasce, followed by Nyberg. Molé has, after West, dōstīk vāč. Translations: West: "friendly words"; Molé: "paroles amicales"; de Menasce: "authentique descendant"; Nyberg: "a true kinsman".

¹¹⁹ The reading adopted here is that of Nyberg. de Menasce has *kē.šān ham paywandīg frāz awiš rasišnīg, Molé has *kē.šān ham.pursag frāz awiš rasišnīg.

¹²⁰ A genuine Bactrian name, Luhrāsp, was substituted for Aurvaṭaspa, the Avestan name of Wištāspa's father, Grenet, Enl 344, Bactria.

¹²¹ Only in K, not found in B.

The fifth book is on the sayings of the *macarios* Adur.farrōbay son of Farraxv.zād, who was the leader of the Zoroastrians¹²², about the book called SMR: "compendious answer of Adur.farrōbay son of Farraxv.zād, who was the leader of the Zoroastrians, to some significant questions asked by Ya'qōb son of Xālid", who was, according to his own words, a genuine descendant of all the peoples called SMR¹²³, who, though being of the tribe¹²⁴ of Ya'qōb, have interruptedly been under the supreme rule of those of Iranian seed, since the time of departing of their ancestors under the chief command of Buxt.Narsēh, as allied generals and with armies of that people, to abolish the vicious laws and misconduct of Children of Israel and their grave demonolatry and the damage of theirs, having been sent by the lord of the countries, Kay Luhrāsp, together with Buxt.Narsēh, from Erān.Sahr against the Byzantine Jerusalem and [about their] sojourning in that region.

¹²² Floruit circa 815-835 CE.

¹²³ Molé 1967: "les tribus que l'on appelle également des lamites".

¹²⁴ Cf. Nyberg 1964, 103.

[TEXT XLII] MX 26.64-6:

ud az Kay.Luhrāsp sūd ēn būd kūš xVadāyīh xōb kard ud andar Yazdān
spāsgār būd ud Ūrsāilēm ī Yahūdān bē kand ud Yahūdān wišōft ud pargandag
kard.

And the profit of Luhrāsp was that his reign was good and he was thankful to gods and he has
destroyed the Jewish Jerusalem and scattered and dispersed the Jews¹²⁵.

[TEXT XLIII] DkM 25.15¹²⁶:

...ciyōn keš ī Yišō ī az Hrōm ud hān ī Mōšē azəz Xazarān ud hān ī Mānī
azəz Turkistān tagīgīh ud cērīh tēān pēš būt bē burd ō wadagīh ud
ōbastagīh andar hamahlān abagand han ī Mānī az Hrōm fīlsō[k]rāyThəz
anāft.

...like the faith of Jesus from Byzantium, and the faith of Moses from the Khazars, and the faith
of Mani from the Uigurs took away the strength and the vigor they had previously possessed,
threw them into vileness and decadence amongst their rivals, and the faith of Mani even
frustrated the Byzantian philosophy.

¹²⁵ Translated in Tafazzoli 1354h.š., 46. Some bibliography on Jewish themes in the Pahlavi literature
includes: Darmesteter 1889a; Darmesteter 1889b; Gray 1904; Gray 1905; Gray 1906; de Menasce
1947b, *passim*; de Menasce 1960; de Menasce 1977; Zand 1988; Ito 1991; the last comprehensive
treatment of the bulk of the existing material in Shaked 1990a.

¹²⁶ Cf. de Menasce 1947b, 239-40; Molé 1967, 237.

[TEXT XLIV] MX 21.25-6:

kū Anērīh ī Hrōmīgān ud Turkānaz abāg ērānagān bē az hān kēn būd tšān
pad ōzadan ī Erac kāšt ud tā frašgird hamē paywandēd.

The enmity /non-Iranianship¹²⁷ of the Byzantians and the Turks, too, towards the Iranians
(originates) from their malice through the murder of Erac and it will be kept (this way) until
the Renovation.

[TEXT XLV] AJ 12.8-9 & 15:

Turkeštān wuzurg gyāg... Hast az awēšān kē Māh paristēnd ud hast kē
jādūg hēnd, ud hast ī Weh.Dēn hēnd ... warz ī ābādānīh kunēnd. ka mTrēnd ō
wēšag abganēnd, ud hast ī ō Wahišt ud hast ī ō Dušaxw ud Hamēstagān
šawēnd.

Turkeštān is a vast place... There are some among them who worship Moon and there are
some who are sorcerers, and there are some who are of the Good Religion¹²⁸ ... they cultivate the
land. When they die, they throw (their dead) in forests, and there are some who go to Paradise,
and there are some who go to Hell and Limbo.

¹²⁷ On ēr as a religious and political, non ethnical, term, cf. Gnoli 1985; *ibid.* 1986; *ibid.* 1989, 136-
48 *et passim*.

¹²⁸ Cf. Boyce 1987b, 127, referring to this passage: "there were Zoroastrians among ... Turks".

[TEXT XLVI] Dk 8.26 Duzdsarnijad 6 Artēštārestān; Dkm 732.13-734.3; DkS XVI, 7-10; DkD 554.22-557.12; West 1892, 86-90; Tafazzoli 1995:

13. abar xVāstag ī anērān bē āwārēnd ud ēd ī azāš paydāg kū man cē gurg cē ayār.

21. abar paykarišn ī spāh sāiār ō anērān pēš az kārezār padēz paygāmbār ud xVāndan īšān ō šāhān šāh bandagīh ud Dēn ī Yazdān paykarišn.

22. abar andarz ō spāh ud paydāgēntān ī nāmcištīg kār andar kō[x]šišn ēwag ēwag bahr ī ahlāyīh niwēyēntān ī ō spāh pādāšn ī kardārān guftan ud āgāhēntān ī ō spāh cīm ī margarzānīh ud zanišnarzāgānīh ī anērān ud framān ī Yazdān abar zanišn ī awēšān ka ērīh nē padīrēnd ud mānāg wuzurg mīzd ud pādāšn ī abar zanišn ī awēšān az Dēn paydāg ud dādestāntīgīh ī Erān.

13. About the wealth that non-Iranians produce, and regarding this it was revealed (in a text):

**what is a wolf for me, what is an aid?*¹²⁹

21. About the dispute of the commander of the (Iranian) army with the non-Iranians before a battle, even through a messenger, calling them into servitude of the King of Kings and disputation about the Religion of Gods.

22. About instruction to the army and informing about particular duty of each one in the combat and the lot of the righteousness¹³⁰, and announcing to the army the reward of the heroes, telling and explaining to the army why the non-Iranians are worthy of death and smiting, and the command of Gods about their destruction, if they do not accept ērīh¹³¹, and, similarly, great recompense and reward for their destruction was revealed from the Avesta and the legitimacy of Erān.

¹²⁹ West 1892, 88: "I, too, am assisting even the wolf"; Tafazzoli 1995b, 299, 300b, saw here a proverb or an Avestan quotation and translated: "Comment un loup (peut-il être) mon aide?". Nevertheless, the sense of the phrase is still opaque.

¹³⁰ The reward of the fallen?

¹³¹ On the concept of ērīh, as subjection to the Sasanian Empire, cf. Gnoli 1986, Gnoli 1990, Gnoli 1992.

[TEXT XLVII] Sāh ī Wahrām¹³² (Blochet's version):

kā šawēd bē ō Hindūgān gowēd kū amāh cē šahrīyārān amāh abāg Tazīgān ud Tūrānīg ud Hrōm ud Cīnestān ud dēwān ī Māzēnīgān kārezār abar burd * hēm, kē awēšān az stōwīh Dēn ī weh ud abēzag ud parastīšn ī Yazdān ud Amahraspandān ud āta[x]š ī suxr [ud] sōzaīg padīrīft hēnd.

When he (the Savior Sāh ī Wahrām) comes, he will tell in India, saying: "We¹³³ who are the ruler, We fought the Arabs, the Turks, Byzantium, China¹³⁴ and the demons of Māzandarān, that they, having been overcome, accepted the Pure Good Religion and the worship of the Yazatas and the Holy Immortals and the red blazen Fire".

¹³² To be dealt with in Chapter IV.

¹³³ Pluralis maiestatis.

¹³⁴ Central Asia, cf. Blochet 1895, 241 n. 6.

APPENDIX I

[TEXT I] Bd 1a.12-13=1.49-51:

12. panjom Gāw ī ēw.dād brēhēnēd andar Erān.wēž pad miyānag ī gēhān pad bār ī rōd ī Weh Daitī, kū miyānag ī gēhān, spād, rōšn ud ciyōn mān kēš bālā 3 nāy ī paymānīg ūš dād ō ayārīh āb ud urwar cēš andar gumēzišn zōr ud waxšīšn az ēn bawēd.

13a. šašom Gayō[k]mard brēhēnēd rōšn ciyōn xʷaršēd ūš 4 nāy ī paymānīg bālā būd, pahnāy ciyōn bālā rāst pad bār ī rōd ī Daitī, kū miyānag ī gēhān ēstād Gayō[k]mard pad hōy ālag, Gāw pad dašn ālag, ūšān dūrīh ēwag az did dūrīhaz ī az āb ī Daitī cand bālā xʷēš būd. casmōmand ud gōšōmand ud uzwānōmand ud daxšōmand būd, Gayō[k]mard daxšōmandīh ēd kū mardom az āwē tōhm pad hān hāngōšīdag zād hēnd.

13b. ūš dād ō ayārīh xʷāb āsanīh.dādār, cē Ohrmazd hān xʷāb frāz brēhēnēd pad mard karb ī buland ī 15-sālag ī rōšn, ūš Gayō[k]mard abāg Gāw az zamīg brēhēnēd, ūš az rōšnīh ud zargōnīh ī asmān šusr ī mardomān ud gāwān frāz brēhēnēd ciyōn ēn dō šusr āta[x]š.tōhmag nē āb.tōhmag, pad tan ī Gayō[k]mard ud Gāw bē dād tāš purr.rawištīh ī mardomān ud gōspandān azeš būd.

12. Fifth, He (Ohrmazd) created the the One-Begotten Bull in Erān.wēž in the middle of the world on the bank of the river Weh Daitī, which is in the middle of the world, shining/white¹, bright, like the moon², whose height was 3 average reeds, and He created water and plants³ to assist (the Bull), for in this Mixture(-state of the world), (the Bull) derives strength and growth from these.

13a. Sixth He created Gayō[k]mard shining like Sun⁴, he was as high as the height of 4 average reed, his width as his height, on the bank of the river Daitī, which is in the middle of the world, Gayōmard on the left side, the Bull on the right side, and their distance one from the other and their distance from the river Daitī was as much as their height; they had eyes, ears, tongues, distinguishing marks⁵; the distinguishing mark of Gayōmard is this that men were born from his seed in (his) likeness.

13b. He created the repose-giving sleep⁶ to (his) assistance, for Ohrmazd created forth this sleep in the form of a 15 years old tall luminous male, and He created Gayōmard and the Bull from the earth, and from the light and the verdure of the sky⁷ He created forth the sperm of men and cattle, as the sperm of both (groups) has its origin in fire, not in water, and He put it in the bodies of Gayōmard and the Bull in order that from it there might be the complete progress/propagation of men and cattle.

¹ In some Iranian languages, and especially, in Armenian, "white" means also "shining".

² Or: "bright like the moon".

³ The context of "moon" (and "sun"), light, plants may suggest some comparison to certain Manichaean doctrines.

⁴ Implicating that the second element of the word xʷaršēd was understood correctly by the Zandists' tradition. This usage in the context of the First Man Gatō[k]mard may suggest that the same element, šēd, in the name of another First Man, Yima Xšaēta, Jamšēd, could also be understood as "shining". Note that the Bull is compared to the Moon, while the Man to the Sun.

⁵ Note the similar, though problematic, sequence in Dk 9.21.19: dōšōmand [kūšān kalak hast] sūlāxōmand [kūšān sūlax hast] *did-xʷānīšnōmand. This additional striking parallel between Dk 9.21 and Bd 1 may suggest that both texts (dealing, i.e., with the First Man) were drawing upon common sources.

⁶ So also Ankesaria 1956, 27; Zaehner 1955, 320: "sleep, the repose of the Creator". Cf. Dk 9.21.3.

⁷ Compare Bailey 1974.

[TEXT II] Bd 1.53. (TD2 14.3-15.2; Zaehner 1955, 282, 317 [§§ 31-34])TD 2 14-15:

... nazdist [Ohrmazd] Wahman brēhēntd, kēš rawāgTh ī dām ī Ohrmazd azaš
 būd ...; ūš Wahman az nēwag.rawiśnTh ī getīg rōšnTh nazdist brēhēntd, kēš
 Dēn ī weh ī Mazdēsnaē abāg būd; ēn kū hān ī ō dām rasēd tā Frašgird aš
 dānist; pas Ardwašīst, pas Sahrēwar, pas Spandarmet, pas Hurdād ud pas
 Amurdād brēhēntd; 7-om xVad Ohrmazd, 8-om rāst.gōwiśnTh, 9-om Srōš ī
 ahlaw, 10-om Mānθraspand, 11-om Nēryōsang, 12-om rad ī buland Raθwō[k]
 Berzait, 13-om Rašn ī rāst, 14-om Mihr ī fraxV.gayod, 15-om Aršīšwang ī
 weh, 16-om, Pārand, 17-om XVāb, 18-om Wād, 19-om DādestānōmandTh, 20-om
 Paykār, PešēmāīTh, PasēmāīTh ud Aštīh ī AbzōnīgTh.

... first, [Ohrmazd] created Wahman, through whom the progress of Ohrmazd's creation
 occurs ...; He first created Wahman from the goodly progress of material light, with whom the
 Good Mazdayasnian Religion was; it means, he (Wahman) knew what will befall creation up to the
 Renovation; then Ardwašīst, then Sahrēwar, then Spandarmet, then Hurdād, and then
 Amurdād; 7th, Ohrmazd Himself, 8th Truthful Speech, 9th Srōš ī ahlaw, 10th
 Mānθraspand, 11th Nēryōsang, 12th the exalted ratu Raθwō Berzait, 13th Rašn the
 Just, 14th Mihr of wide pastures, 15th the good Aršīšwang, 16th, Pārand, 17th Sleep, 18th
 Wād (the Wind), 19th Lawfulness, 20th Quarrel, Prosecution, (legal) Defence and Peace of
 Bounty.

[TEXT III] Bd 19, TD2 128.11-129.11:

abar clyōnTh ī xʷāb⁸

1. pad Dēn gōwēd kū fradom xʷāb⁹ pad dahišn dād pad mard karb 15-sālag ī spēd dōisr ud awē.z dēwān āhōgēnīd clyōn āb ud urwar ud gōspand ud razōr, kōf ud sa[n]g ud ēdaraz¹⁰ cāhaz¹¹ ...; ud hamē āhōgēnīd ēstēd kē.zəš gōhr andar gumēxt ēstēd.

2. hān xʷāb¹² pad hān asp karb 1 gušn ī 4- ayāb 5-sālag az pas ī *mādagān¹³ awē šawēd ud awē.z az pas ī mardomān rasēd az bālist ī sar tā ušnūg, and cand drahnāy pattayēd kū 3 ayāb 4 yaθā ahū wairiōs; he (Sleep) was not created with a body, for he was created at once separately from the body-aspect, for when the body was created, Sleep was behind it.

3. ka mardom wēš xʷabēnd kū 4 wēcast drahnāy adādīhā, xʷāb¹⁵ pad hamē mardom bē rasēd, ka ēwag xʷabēd, pad hān ī didīgar ēstēd, ka hamē mardomān nē xʷabēnd, pad tu[x]šay.kārīh kunēnd, hān ēstēd, cē *har¹⁶ kas pad xʷēš stī clyōn xʷāb¹⁷ hast.

Bd 19a, TD2 129.11-129.14

ēnəz gōwēd kū zamīg ud āb ud urwar nē tu[x]šayīh rāy ka bar dahēnd ud nē xuftagīh ud amardīh rāy ka bar nē dahēnd, cē tu[x]šayīh ud xuftagīh ud amardīh pad mardom ud gōspand sardagān bawēd.

8 TD2: xwyb y.

9 TD2: xwyh xwyb.

10 The reading is not sure.

11 The reading in Anklesaria 1956, 164, is different.

12 TD2: xwyb y.

13 KNE>n < *NKE>n.

14 TD2: xwyb y.

15 TD2: xwyb y.

16 MDH.

17 TD2: xwyb y.

On the Nature of Sleep

1. He says in the Avesta: "First He created Sleep in the creation, in the form of a 15 years old male, with shining/bright eyes, and even him the demons have defiled, like water and plants and cattle and forests, mountains and stones and *here, *too, *even the *wells, all remains defiled, for their/its substance became intermingled"¹⁸.

2. This Sleep, in the equid form of a 4 or 5 years old stallion, goes after females, and he even reaches after males, from the top of the head to the knees, and he remains for as long as one can recite, from the beginning, 3 or 4 yaθā ahū vairiōs; he (Sleep) was not created with a body, for he was created at once separately from the body-aspect, for when the body was created, Sleep was behind it.

3. When men sleep for a period more than 4 wēcast, it is unlawful; Sleep comes on all men; when one sleeps, (Sleep) stands in the other, when all men will not sleep, but (rather) will be diligent, it (Sleep) will stand, for every man has in his own being something like Sleep.

Bd 19a

This, too, He says: "the earth, the water, the plants yield fruits not through diligence, and do not yield fruits not through sleepiness and impotence", for diligence, sleepiness and impotence exist in the species of humans and animals.

18 Or: ... sa[n]g. ud ēdaraz cē.z hast ud hamē āhōgēnīd ēstēd kē.zəš gōhr andar gumēxt ēstēd, "and stones. And even here, (everything) whatever there is, all remains defiled, for their/its substance became intermingled".

[TEXT IV] Dk 9.32.7-10:

7. ud ēnaz kū watar šmah druwandēd pad han ī weh zōhr pad gōwišn dēwān
yazēd pad awēšān zōhr hān ī watar windēd pādāšn hānaz ī ērang dušax^V.

8. ēnaz kū awēšān kēntg dēwān¹⁹ rāy ō tō āgāhīā fradom gōwom ka mad
hēnd ō gēhān kū fradom ka andar dwārist hēnd ašān dādestān ciyōn būd.

9. 30satō[k]zim hān ī man gēhān būd hēnd amarg azarmān Zardu[x]št ka hān
ī šmah 30-om satō[k]zim bē sāxt būd Spitāmān ēg ō hān ī man Gayō[k]mard
hān ī dēwān dād x^Vēy frāz mad pad bēš ī hān and zamān cand mard ēn
gōwišn frāz gōwēd ī ax^Vōmand ud radōmand yaθā[k] ahu[k] wairyō[k].

10. ud ka az hān x^Vēy frāz būd asāyag būd kū tārtgīh andaç mad būd ūm ēg²⁰
ēn gōwišn frāz guft ī ax^Vōmand ud radōmand ud kām wāstāram guft būd ēg
dēw ō tom *ortād²¹ hēnd.

7. And this, too: "you are the worse wicked ones, you worship demons through this good zōhr-
oblation, through (good) formulas, through them the zōhr-oblation obtains this worse reward"
[and this one who is a heretic - (his reward) is the hell].

8. This, too, "I will tell thee first intelligibly about these envious demons, when the came to the
world, i.e., when the first rushed (daevically) in, how their affair was / how there became their
judgement (law)".

9. For 30 centuries those of this world of Mine were immortal, without old age, O Zoroaster!
When this 30th century of yours has passed, O Spitāmān! Then the sweat created by demons came
on to My Gayōmard, to harm him, (for) as much a time as one (needs) to recite this this yaθā
ahu wairō formula, which possesses (the qualities of) an *ahu* and a *ratu*.

10. And after he went forth from this sweat, he became shadowless, for the darkness came in, and
then I uttered this formula, which possesses (the qualities of) an *ahu* and a *ratu*, and when (the
word) wāstāram was uttered by Me, then the demons fell into the gloom.

19 Cf. PY 32.8a: awēšān [dēwān] kēntg [wināhkārān], "these [demons] envious ones
[sinners]", similarly in PY 32.7a: awēšān kēntg, "these envious ones".

20 West 1892, 254, read here *ēwēn.

21 DkM: ZK PLWNyt; DkD: ZKPWNkt.

[TEXT V] PY 38.3:

apō at yazamaidē maēkaiantīšcā haēuuaiantīšcā frauuazāhō
ahurāntš ahurahiā hauuapayhā. huparēθēšcā vā huuō.γžāθēšcā hušnāθēšcā
ubōibiā ahubiā cagēmā.

We worship the waters which are tasty and juicy, the Ahurāntš which flow through the artful
work of the Ahura. (We worship) you, (the waters) which provide good crossing, which flow
well, and are good to swim in: a support for both existences²².

The Pahlavi version of Y 38.3 is as follows:

āb ēdōn yazom maēkaiantī [paššing ī pad urwar abar ēstēd maznīhā]
haēuuaiantī [garān tazīšn] hānaz frauuāz [ī wārāntg] hān ī ahurāntš [armēšt
ud cāhtg ud ābānīgēz āb anāmcištīg] ahurahiā [šusr] hān ī hauuapayhā
[mēšag]. hu.wīdargīh šmah [amān dahēd kūmān nam andar tan rawāg bawād]
hudāgīh [ars] ud hušnāysnīgīh [kūmān x^Vēh az tan bē āyād] hān ī andar har
dō ax^Vān kāmāg [rōyn²³].

Thus I worship the water: *maēkaiantī* [the exudation which is in plants²⁴ as vapor],
haēuuaiantī [flowing from mountains], *frauuāz* [that of rain], *ahurāntš* [still (water)
and well-water, and also every kind of water, water indefinitely], *ahurahiā*
[semen]²⁵, *hauuapayhā* [urine]²⁶, good passage (of) yours [(let you) give us, so may we have
freshness in our bodies], *good disposition²⁷ [tears]²⁸, good bathing [may our sweet²⁹
persipate from our bodies!], that which is desired in both existences [oil]³⁰.

22 Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 57.

23 M⁵H².

24 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 15-om, hān ī azēr ī hāwan ī urwarān, "15th, (the fluid) which is under the
bark of plants".

25 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 5-om, šusr ī gōspandan ud mardomān, "5th, the semen cattle and men".

26 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 6-om, gōmēz ī gōspandan ud mardomān, "6th, the urine of cattle and men".

27 What I transcribe hudāgīh, Dhabhar 1946, Glossar, 47, read it hvagjīkīh, "flowing fully",
stating that the word is a mere transcription of hvōgžāθā, i.e., huuō.γžāθē; AIW 1857 read similarly
to my reading. The translation is fully conjectural.

28 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 9-om, ars ī gōspandan ud mardomān, "9th, the tears of cattle and men".

29 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 13-om, x^Vēy ī gōspandēn ud mardomān, "13th, the perspiration of cattle
and men".

30 Cf. Bd 11b (21): 11-om, rōyn ī andar gōspandan ud mardomān pad har dō ax^Vān kāmāg,
"11th, the oil in cattle and men, desired in both existences".

[TEXT VIa] Y 44.5c:

... kš huuāp x^vafnamcā dā[] zaēmācā ..."Which artisan (created) both sleep and waking?"³¹,

the Pahlavi version of which as follows:

kē pad hu.āyābag[] x^vāb³² dād ud zēnawand[] [tu[x]šāg[]],

"who, in good acquisition, created sleep/sweat and vigilance [diligence]?"

[TEXT VIb] DkM 852.8-17³³:

man dām dād Zardu[x]št pad Wahman andar gēhān ka.m awēšān frāz dād ī
 purr purr.sardag 30 stō[k]zīm hān ī man dām būd azarman ud amarg
 Zardu[x]št andar hān ī 30 stō[k]zīm nē būd suy ud tišn ud nē x^vēy tan ud nē
 zēnawand[] ud nē zarman būdan nē marg[] ud nē hān ī sard wād ud nē hān ī
 garm. amarg hān ī man gēhān būd hamāg rōšn hān ī ahlawān stī. ēg
 āhōgēnišn abar mad ō gēhān ī astōmand ī ahlāy[] pas az dādan x^vēy ud
 zēnawand[] azāš ūm dād rōz ud šab ūm pas dād uš ud rāpisp.

I created creation, O Zoroaster!, through Wahman in the world(s), when I created them, during
 3000 years this creation of Mine, full of all kinds, was excepted from old age and immortal, O
 Zoroaster!, during 3000 years there was no hunger and thirst, and no sleep of the body and no
 vigilance, no old age and no death, and no cold wind and no hot (wind). This world of Mine was
 without death, all bright, this existence of the righteous. Then the fault came into the corporeal
 world of righteousness. After having created the sleep and the vigilance, I created then the day and
 the night, the dawn and the midday.

³¹ Humbach and Ichaporia 1994, 67.

³² A variant (Dhabhar 1949, 187 [12]): x^vēy, "sweat".

³³ Ok 9.37[DkM 851.21-854.10].5, according to the division by Molé: in West 1892 there is a lacuna; transcribed and translated in Molé 1967, 210-211

[TEXT VII] WZs 2.10 (Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 36-7:

pēš az frāz madan ī ō Gayō[k]mard, hast ciyōn 3 nāy ī Zardu[x]št bāīāy būd
 rōšn būd ciyōn x^varšēd, Ohrmazd x^vē³⁴ brēhēnīd pad mard karb ī 15-sālag
 ī rōšn ī buland, ūš abar frēstīd ō Gayō[k]mard ūš x^vē awiš burd andāz,
 drahnāy cand yaθā ahd wairō[k] ew abar gōwthēd,

Before coming to Gayōmard, whose height was as high as 3 Zoroaster's lances, and he was
 bright like Sun, Ohrmazd created Sleep in the body of a man, tall and bright, 15 years old, and
 He sent it upon Gayōmard and brought it upon him for as long as one can recite one yaθā ahd
 vairīd.

³⁴ Thus read by Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 36.

[TEXT VIII] Bd 4.20, 22-23 (TD2, 43.11-44.10):

20. pēš az madan ī ō Gāw, Ohrmazd mang ī bēšāz kē hast banj³⁵ xVānēd, ō Gāw pad xVardan dād, pēš ī casm bē māitd, kū wiš az zanišn bazag, wizand, dušrāmih kam bawēd. pad ham zamān nizār ud wēmār būdud pēm bē šud, frāz widard.

...

22. pēš az madan ī ō Gayō[k]mard, Ohrmazd xVāb abar Gayō[k]mard frāz burd and cand drahnāy wēcast ēw bē gōwēd, kēš brēhēnīd Ohrmazd hān xVāb pad mard tan ī gušn ī 15-sālag ī rōšn ī buland.

23. ka Gayō[k]mard az xVāb frāz būd, dīd gehān tārīk ciyon šab, zamīg ciyōn sōzan tix [az dwārišn ī xrafstarān] nē pargūd, spihr ō gardišn, xVāršēd ud mäh ō rawišn ēstād pad tahōmand gehān, az yarrānišn ī Māzigān dēwān ud kō[x]šišn ī abāg axtarān.

20. Before coming to the Bull, Ohrmazd gave to the Bull to eat the healing *mang*, which is what is called *banj*, rubbed it before (the Bull's) eyes, in order that the pain from the sin, hurt, injury occurring from the killing may diminish; (the Bull) immediately became feeble and ill, (his)³⁶ milk disappeared and he passed away.

...

22. Before coming to Gayōmard, Ohrmazd brought upon Gayōmard Sleep, for as long as one can recite one wēcast, for Ohrmazd created Sleep in the male body of a man, tall and bright, 15 years old.

23. When Gayōmard awoke from his sleep, he saw the world dark as night, on the earth was not left free space even as much as the edge of a needle, owing to rushing of *xrafstras*, the Sphere was revolving, Sun and Moon were set in motion in the world possessing a bottom, owing to roaring giant demons and (their) war with the Signs of the Zodiac.

³⁵ bnc.

³⁶ Supposingly, the Gāw/Bull was hermaphrodite.

[TEXT IX] WZs 30.32 30, Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1990, 102-4:

... ka tan ēd/xvēy³⁷ kunēd gyān andar tan ruwān bēron ud bōy miyān ī awēšān paygambārīh kunēd... ud abdom ka tan widerēd, āta[x]š.gōrīh rāy ka az zamīg bē ō mēnōg šawēd, fradom ō āta[x]š gumēxtēd ud hān sē rōz ī pas az marg pad nazdikīh ī tan pādag ō kālboḍ ī tan hamē nigerēd, padēš griyēd ud ka sag ud way frāz šawēnd ud tan darrēnīd kāmēnd, frāz tarsēd ciyōn owōn mēš az gurg

... when the body behaves thus/falls asleep³⁸, the gyān-soul is in the body, but the ruwān-soul is outside (the body), and the bōy-conscience acts as a messenger between them ... and finally, when the body passes away, because of its fiery essence³⁹, when it (bōy) goes from earth to the mēnōg, first it mixes with the fire and these 3 days after the death it looks after the corpse of the body, guarding it in the vicinity and wailing on it, and when the dogs and the birds go wanting to tear (the body) out (the bōy) is frightened like a sheep of a wolf ...

³⁷ On two possibilities of reading, cf. Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1990, 170, n. 32 (Tafazzoli argued for *xwamn/xwamr).

³⁸ Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 103: "quand le corps agit ainsi/s'endort".

³⁹ The semen of men and cattle is of fiery nature, cf. Bd 1a.3.

APPENDIX II

Sadwēs

Satauuāša, an Avestan masculine deity and the opponent of Anāhītā, the helper of the rain-producing Tištrya (Yt 8.9, 13.43), became in Manichaeism the feminine deity Sadwēs, a counterpart of Neryōsang, identified with the Maiden of Light, qnygrwšn, cf. Boyce 1949-51. In the Zoroastrian texts, she is the chieftain of the South, which is the benevolent direction for the Zoroastrians, but the evil direction for the Manichaeans. In Bd 5b.12 Sadwēs is said to restrain the planets Ohrmazd and Anāhīd from doing harm, thus being an evidence to what extent the names of the planets became de-etymologized, and for this reason, Sadwēs is called beneficent. Sadwēs was closely associated with Tištr, Sirius, cf. especially Bd 5b.14; in Bd 10.11 the star Sadwēs is said to be connected by band, "links", to the lake of the same name⁴⁰.

All the passages, except of the first and the last ones, were translated in MacKenzie 1964; my translations differ on some points.

GrBd TD2 27.1-3, Bd 2.4:

ciyōn gōwēd kū Tištr xvarāšān spāhbed Sadwēs Nēmroz spāhbed Wanand xvarōfrān spāhbed Haftō[k]ring Abāxtar spāhbed...

As [the Avesta] says: Tištr is the chieftain of the East, Sadwēs is the chieftain of the South, Wanand is the chieftain of the West, Haftōring is the chieftain of the North...

⁴⁰ We probably should compare these "links" to Manichaean *liṣne*, cf. below.

TD2 57.7-12; Bd 5b.12:

Pad bun ka Ebgad andar dwārist, ēwēn jast kū Mihr ud Mān ī tamīg [*ham?] paymānagih abāg rah ī xʷaršēd ud Māh rāy wināh.kārth nē tuwān kardan, ud Haftōring ud Sadwēs az Ohrmazd ud Anāhīd frēh nērōgtar jast hēnd ū.šān Ohrmazd ud Anāhīd az wināh.kardan padīran[ēn]īd, ham.cim rāy, axtar.āmārān awēšān rāy pad kirbag.kar xʷānēnd...

In the beginning, when the Assault rushed inside, it happened in that manner that Mihr and the Dark Moon could not make any harm, because of their [*mutual?] pact with the chariot(s?) of Sun and Moon, and Haftōring (the Great Bear) and Sadwēs (Fomalhaut?) were of greater power than Ohrmazd (Jupiter) and Anāhīd (Venus), and they restrained⁴⁴ Ohrmazd (Jupiter) and Anāhīd (Venus) from doing harm, for this very reason, the astrologers call them beneficent...

TD2 58.9-12; Bd 5b.14:

gōwēd kū Anāhīd āb.cihrag cē. hamēstār Sadwēs āb.cihrag ud Tīr wādīg gōwēnd, cē.šā hamēstār Tīštr ud Wād ī wārān kirdārān.

(The Avesta) says that Anāhīd (Venus) is of a watery nature, for her opponent Sadwēs (Fomalhaut?) is of a watery nature, and Tīr (Mercury) they call airy, for he is the opponent of Tīštr (Sirius) and Wād (Wind), producers of rain.

TD2 B3.10-12, Bd 10.11:

Band ī War ī Sadwēs ō Sadwēs stārag bast ēstēd kē.š drayābthā ī kust ī Nēmroz andar pānagih ōyon ciyōn Haftōring *rūd *ī kustag ī Abāxtar andar pānagih.

The connection of the Lk. Sadwēs is attached to the star Sadwēs, under whose protection are the seas of the Southern side, just as *the river(s) *of the Northern side are under protection of Haftōring (the Great Bear).

44 MacKenzie 1964, 519 n. 44; MacKenzie 1971, 63.

CHAPTER III

II

APPENDIX III

[TEXT I] Y 31.5:

taḡ mōi vīcidiāi vaocā	hiiaḡ mōi ašā datā vahiiō
vidyue vohu managhā	māncā daidiāi yehliā mā arēšiš
tācī mazdā ahurā	yā nōi vā aḡhaḡ aḡhaiti vā.

That tell me, to discern, what is assigned for me (as) the better (lot), in the ašā-("realm of righteous bliss")
to learn/know with good thought, to keep in mind, from Whom to me (shall come) the Right, these, O Lord Wisdom, which are not to be, or are to be.

[TEXT II] PY 31.5:

a. hān ō man wizārd gōwē [ud rōšnag gōwē kū hān mīzd ciyōn ō xʷēš šāyēd kardan] kē ō man pad ahlāyih [ka.m kār ud kirbag kard ēstēd] dahišn ī weh [kū.m hān mīzd ī weh ōh dahišn]
b. āgāh.dahišnīh ī pad Wahman ō man hān dahē [kū.m hān dānagih pad frārōnih bē gōwē] kē man [pad hān ī awē] hān ī ō¹ Ariš [kū.m pad hān dānagih frārōnih passax^v ō Ariš tuwān bawad dādan]
c. hānēz Ohrmazd nē hast hān ī hast rāy [gōwēd] [kū gāōnīgih rāy ī hast gōwēd kū nēst].

a. Tell me that discernedly [and tell me that clearly, namely, how one should appropriate this reward], he who should give me in good righteousness [when I have performed my duty and meritorious deed] [*i.e.*, I should be given thus this good reward]

b. the assignment of knowledge through Wahman is that which you should give² me³ [*i.e.*, announce to me this wisdom in virtuousness!], which is mine [through it], this which is for Ariš [*i.e.*, that through this virtuousness of wisdom it shall become possible to me to reply Ariš]

c. about these, too, Ohrmazd!, that exist and that do not exist [do say!] [*i.e.*, do say, for sake of the Gāōic knowledge, what does exist and what does not!].

1 For the reading, compare West 1892, 246 n. 7.

2 daidiāi: "to see".

3 An error: māncā means "in mind"!

[TEXT III] Dk 9.31.6-11; West 1892, 246-8; §§7-8; Zaehner, 1955, 31:

6. ud abar drāyīšn ī Ariš dēw ō Zardu(x)št ud passax^v ī Zardu(x)št pad hān ī Ohrmazd andarz ud cē andar ham dar ciyōnēš Dēn gōwēd kūš ō awē guft Ariš dēw kū "ēg Franāmam Zardu(x)št ō hān ī dēwān hanjaman kē tō rāy nišīnēnd pad ham gāh 3 šab 4 rōz".

7. pursīdēš az awē Zardu(x)št kū: "Arišam drōz.tom cē.m pad hān pādāšn hast hagar šmāh pad gōwišn yazam?".

8. ūš ō awē guft Ariš ī dēwān drōz.tom kū: "tō pādixšāy bawēh andar mardomān pad kāmāg dahišnīh andar axvān ciyōnēt x^vad abāyēd ud ahōš bawē Spitamān".

9. ūš az awē pursīd Zardu(x)št kū: "Ariš ī dēwān drōz.tom mardom kēš šmāh yašt hēnd padēz hān ī zahāg pus padēz hān ī pad hunsandīh x^vast jeh kūš pad x^vēštīh ī šmāh dāšt ciyōn kas az awēšān ahōš?".

10. ūš hān ī awē nē guft was āgāhīh Ariš ī dēwān drōz.tom.

11. guftēš Zardu(x)št kū: "awē hom awē dōšom kū awē x^vad hom ud ciš ī awē kunom ud hān dād ud hān āfrīgānīh ōšmurom ī hudānāg Ohrmazd ī kāmāg rāmēntīdār".

[TEXT IV] PY 31.14:

a. hān ī har dō az tō pursom Ohrmazd kū mad kū rasēd

b. kē ābām dahēd az dāsārān az hān ō awē ī ahlaw [az hān ciyōn abāyēd dād]

c. Ohrmazd kē.z ō druwandān ciyōn awēšān hēnd hangirdīgīh ēdōn [ēn kū awē dādestān cē awē dādestān cē ēm be gōwī!].

6. And about the daevic chatter of the dēw Ariš to Zoroaster and the reply of Zoroaster by Ohrmazd's advice, and whatever on the same subject, as the Avesta tells, that the dēw Ariš said him: "Then Franāmam⁴, O Zoroaster, to this gathering of dēws, who sit for you in the same place 3 nights and 4 days!".

7. Zoroaster asked him: "O Ariš, the most deceitful to me, what reward would there be for me, if I worship you with sayings (ritual formulae)?".

8. And Ariš, the most deceitful of dēws, said him: "You will be powerful among men, through producing (your) will among the existences, just as it should be fitting you, and you would become immortal, O Spitamān!".

9. And Zoroaster asked him: "O Ariš, the most deceitful of dēws, people who worship you, for the birth of a child, or for a whore sought for content, that they are in your possession, how can anyone of them be immortal?".

10. And Ariš, the most deceitful of dēws, could not tell him, who was the most intelligent.

11. Zoroaster said him: "I am His, and I love Him, i.e., I am His own and I do his affair, and I recite the law and the blessing of the wise Ohrmazd, the appeaser of desires!".

a. These two I ask you, Ohrmazd, about (things) that have come and will reach (us)

b. who gives obligation from the gifts of this to the righteous [wherefrom it should be given],

c. O Ohrmazd, and who, too, to the wicked ones; how they are (about the time when) the consummation (takes place) [this judgment; i.e., tell me what is this judgment!].

[TEXT V] Dk 9.30, Aṭ.tā.vaxšiiā; DkM 828.15-831.5; DkS XVII, 85-90; West 1892, 241-245²:

1. haftom fragard Aṭ.tā.vaxšiiā/At.tā[k].waxšē az ēzišnōmandīh ud niyāyišnōmandīh ī dēn ud mānōr mēnōg. ud ēnēz kū mēnōg ī ēzišn ī awē humenīdār³ ī āgāh ī dānāg⁴ mard tēz abar gumēxtēd ō hān ī xwāšēd rōšnīh ō kāmāg hanjāmīh⁵ ud urwāhm⁶ ī Amahraspandān paywandēd.
2. abar wizišn ī mardomān kām ud rāh ī ō mīzd pad wizišnkarīh būdan.
3. ud abar andarz ī ō mardomān pad xwāštan ī hān gāh kē dagr pad kāmāg abar mān[d]īstan šayēd ud ōsmurdan ud hammōxtan⁷ ī Dēn [ī] Yazdān.
4.⁸ ud az gōwišn ī Zardu[x]št abar drayīstan ī Ariš dēw ō mardomān: "Ohrmazd ud Ahriman 2 brādr ī pad ēwag askom[b] būd hēnd, az awēšān Amahraspand ēw hān ī wattar dōštīd pad hān ī kaš šnāsagān dēwān.ēzišnīh guft ud ēn ku pas*īh gōspand dahēd ō abāxtarīgān dēwān".

¹ The change in numeration of the following pages is the result of a serious computer problem which cannot be solved otherwise. The problem occurred on the latest stage of editing.

² Individual passages were edited and translated in: Schaefer 1930, 90-1[-288-9] (1-5); Benveniste 1932-33, 209-11 (4-5); Widengren 1938, 246 (7); Bailey 1943, 127 (7); Zaehner 1955, 429-31 (829.1-5); Molé 1963, 203 (1), 204 (4-5), 334-5 (6-7); Shaked 1971, 92 (5). Cf. ALSO Darmesteter 1887, ZA i 221 n. 10; Blochet 1898, 28.

³ Cf. PY 30.1c: kē humenīdār pad ahlāyīh...

⁴ PY 30.1a: ēdōn hān ī har dō gōwišn xwāyīšn ī Ohrmazd.dād [Abistāg ud Zand] kē.z āgāh [kū dānāg] ēš hērbēdestān kuhīšn, "thus these are both, the (praiseful) saying and teaching, created by Ohrmazd [Avesta and Zand], who, too, (is) intelligent [i.e., the wise one is who knows to perform hērbēd's functions]", where ēzišnōmandīh ud niyāyišnōmandīh (Dk) have gōwišn xwāyīšn as their equivalents in PY. Compare also PY 30.3b: kē stāyīšn ī Ohrmazd ud yazīšn ī Wahman [kūš paydāg hān ī Abistāg ud Zand], "(to) whom (is) praise of Ohrmazd and worship of Wahman [whom these Avesta and Zand are revealed]", where stāyīšn ī Ohrmazd ud yazīšn ī Wahman have dēn ud mānōr (dēn = Abistāg, mānōr = Zand) as their equivalents in Dk.

⁵ Molé 1963, 203: kāmāc *hučāšmīh, "a la beauté".

⁶ Taken from PY 30.1a: kē humenīdār pad ahlāyīh hānēz [kē ciš ī frārōn menēd] ēš kirbag ī yazīšn meh bawēd [kē.šān andar rōšnīh pad wēnišn urwāhmīh [kē.šān ka mēnōg ī yazīšn wēnēd, ēšān rāmišn bawēd], "One who is good-thinking in righteousness, this, too [one who thinks virtuous things, the merit for his worship will be great], that they are in Light in visible delightfulness [when they see the "spirit" of worship, there will be peace/happiness for them]", where humenīdār stands for humāzdrā, pad ahlāyīh stands for ašā, hānēz stands for yecā.

Cf. Bd 1a.6, urwāhmānīh, "Joy", produced for assistance of the Sky, ō ayārīh ī asmān.

⁷ Cf. PY 30.2c: kū pad hān meh kār [pad passāxt ī pad tan ī pasēn] ō hān ī hammōxtīšn ī amāh nigēzēnd pādāšn [kūmān ciš ī frārōn hammōxtan rāy pādāšn kunēm], "i.e., at this great work [at the trial of the Final Body] they expose rewards for our teaching [i.e., we give reward for teaching virtuous things]".

⁸ Zaehner 1955, 429-430.

1. The seventh fragard Aṭ.tā.vaxšiiā (contains some) of the liturgical and praiseful character of the Religion (Avesta?) and of the mēnōg ("spirit") of the Mānōra-. And this, too, that the mēnōg of the worship (performed) by a good-thinking, intelligent and wise man is quickly mixed up with the light of the sun and attached to the completion of desire[s]⁹ and joy[s] of the Bountiful Immortal Ones.
2. About the existence of the human choice of will and the way to reward through (this) decision-making.
3. And about the advice to people to seek that place in which it is possible to stay long in love and to study and teach the Religion of Gods.
4. From the saying of Zoroaster concerning the daevic chatter of the demon Ariš to mankind: "Ohrmazd and Ahriman were two brothers in one womb. Of them an Amahraspand chose the worse inasmuch as his adherents preach the worship of demons and that they should offer cattle¹⁰ (as sacrifice) to the demons of the planets"¹¹.

⁹ West 1892, 241: "accomplishment of the wishes".

¹⁰ The reading is by Zaehner. Benveniste: pasāš, "henceforth" (désormais).

¹¹ Cf. Zaehner 1955, 429-430.

5. ud abar drōzānšh ī Ariš dēw ud jud.bunth ī rošn ud tom ud wēhth ī hān ī rošn sth pad wizēn ud waršt ud wadh ī hān ī tom.

6. *dranjīdan¹² ī Gannāg Mēnōg kū hān ī wattar menišn man hast, Spenāg Mēnōg ī hān ī wattar gōwišn, hān ī wattar kunišn¹³, hān ī tamīgtar hast wastarg ī was stabr ī duš-xīrtar¹⁴ [kū and cand wēš šawēnd tārīgtar] dušmat ud dušhuxt ud dušwaršt man hast x^varišn; hān awēšān dōšom kē andar hān hast pad dušmat ud dušhuxt ud dušhuwaršt.

12 druxtan? West: "the grumbling of the Evil Spirit"; Sanjana: *dandTdan or *davyaTdan, comparing Avestan *davata*; Molé 1963, 334-5: yōyitan, "hurler".

13 Cf. two notes later.

14 Molé 1963, 334: duš-adartar.

5. And on the deceit of the demon Ariš, and the separate origin¹⁵ of light and darkness, and the goodness of the luminous being through choice and action, and the evil of the dark (being)¹⁶.

6. The Stinking Spirit *yelled: "I am that of bad-thinking, O Good Spirit! I am that of bad-speaking, that of bad-acting, what is darker and very coarse and of worse matter¹⁷ is my garment [*i.e.*, so far as many go, (it becomes) darker]; bad thought, bad word and bad deed are my food; I love those who are inside that (bad dark matter) through (their) bad thought, bad word and bad deed".

15 Schaefer 1930, 91[-289], rendered jud *bunth* as "Dualität". Note that Mani designated his religion as *bun*.

16 Cf. Shaked 1971, 92.

17 West 1892, 242: "with lower corners"; Molé 1963, 334-5: ["Le vêtement le plus sombre, le plus violent,] *le plus abject* [est a moi].

7. ud guftan ī ōhrmazd kū hān ī weh menišn man hast, Gannāg mēnōgī, hān ī weh gōwišn, hān ī weh kunišn¹⁸ āsmān man hast wastarg¹⁹ kē fradom frāz brīhēntīd az hān ī gētīgān ī stī kē pad hān sa[n]g ī abar harwisp sa[n]g²⁰ bē dād ēstēd [kū-š hamāg gōhr²¹ andar pēsīd ēstēd]; hūmat ud huxt <ud> huwaršt man hast; xVārišn awēšān dōšom kē andar hān hast pad hūmat ud huxt <ud> huwaršt.

8. ud ēnāz kū nē-šān rāst bē wizīdan dušgannāg dēw nē²² hāgīrz rāst bē wizēnēnd kē kāmāg hān ī Akōman.

9. abar wīmārēnīdān ī dēwān hān ī mardomān axVān pad frēftanēz ī mardomān az dēwān frēbišn ud madan ī mardomān pad hān ī axV ō axVīh dušrawīšn²³.

18 Cf. PY 30.3b: menišn ud gōwišn ud kunišn hān ī har dō kē weh ud kēz wad.tar [ēwag hān ī weh menīd ud guft ud kard ud ēwag hān wad.tar], "the way of thinking, the way of speaking, and the way of acting of the two, that of the better and the that of the evil [i.e., one thought and spoke and acted what is good, but the other what is worse]".

19 As Bailey 1943, 122, has observed, this is a paraphrase of Y 30.5 with echoes of Yt 13.3.

20 The Dk version here renders better Avestan xraoždīštā, "the hardest [stones]", used in Y 30.5b, that the PY does: ašəm mainīuš spōništō yā xraoždīštāng ašēnō vastē, ahlāyīh mēnōg ī abzōnīg [Ōhrmazd ahlāyīh dōštīd] kazaš hān ī saxt sa[n]g nīhuft [āsmānēz pad ēd kār pērāmōn ī gēhān bē kard kū tš ahlāyīh rawāg bawād], "The bountiful spirit of righteousness [Ōhrmazd loved righteousness], while he, too, covered in hard stone [he also made sky in such a way around the world, that righteousness could be current]"; AiW to xraoždīštā- gives saxtīum as the Pahlavi rendering, but this reading is not found in the variants of Dhabhar 1949, 136.

In Bd 1a.6 the Sky is said to be xVān.āyēn ī hast gōhr alimāst ī nar (Zaehner 1955, 283, 307; cf.

also Bailey 1943, 132), "of shining metal that is the substance of steel, male" (Zaehner 1955, 318), or "of shining steel, whose substance is of male diamond", Anklešania 1956, 23; on alimās <ἀλμας, both "diamond" and "steel", cf. Bailey 1943, 133-4 [< Akkadian elmešu > Hebrew ḥallāmīš, "flint", Arabic ḥalīnabūs, "firestone"]. Here we have three different renderings of Avestan xraoždīštā-: sa[n]g ī abar harwisp sa[n]g; saxt sa[n]g; xVān.āyēn.

21 gōhr here and in Bd 1a.6 go back to the same source, which cannot be PY 30.5b in its extant form.

22 PY 30.6a: awēšān nē rāst bē wizēnēnd kē dēwān hēnd cegāmāz ē[w] (kū dēwān ciš ī frārōn nē kunēnd) ud kēz awēšān frēft [awēšānēz kē dēwān frēft ēstēnd rāst az nē kunēnd], "those do not choose rightly, even a little, who are dēws [i.e., the dēws do not do virtuous things] and those, too, deceived by them [those, too, whom the dēws deceived, do not do rightly, either]".

23 Cf. PY 30.6c: ēdōn abāg xēšm ō ham dwārīd hēnd ūšān wēmārēnēnd axVān ī mardomān [kū abāg xēšm mardomān āhōgēnēnd], "thus they daevically ran together with Wrath and they sicken men's vital force [i.e., they defile men together with Wrath]".

7.²⁴ And Ōhrmazd said: "I am that of good-thinking, O Stinking Spirit! I am that of good-speaking, that of good-acting, the sky is my garment, which (the sky) was created first of all the gētīg things of the existence, which was made from stone superior to all stones [i.e., which is adorned with precious stones]; good thought, good word and good deed are my food; I love those who are inside that (good light matter) through good thought, good word and good deed".

8. And this, too, that they cannot choose rightly, badly stinking dēws, they never choose rightly whose will is that of Akōman.

9. About dēws' causing maladies to people's vital force, through the deceit of people by the dēws' deception, the coming of people, through this (damaged) vital force, unto decadence of vital force / existence.

24 Partly transcribed and translated in Widengren 1938, 246, and Bailey 1943, 127.

10. ud raseñidan ī ōhrmazd ō dāmān bōzāgīh xVadāyīh ud Dēn dānāgīh ud abāz *pay[y]mīhīstan²⁵ ī padīš rēš ud bēš ō dēwān ud xVadāyīh abāz ō ōhrmazd ud mīzd [ī] Wahman²⁶ ud abestām ī yazdān dārend; ud padīxšayīh pad frazām mardom abar dēw ud weh abar watar ud ahlaw abar druwand; ud abar ciyōnīh ī awēšān ī Frašgīrd kirdār.

11. ud ēnēz kū paydāgīh: "awēšān hēnd, Spitāmān Zardu(x)št, kē Frašgīrd kunānd andar ahū²⁷ girēxt²⁸ awēšān hēnd ud zēnōwand pad xVāhīšn ī ahlāyīh ud sabuk wāng awēšān hēnd ud abar pad menīšn ahlāyīh ahlāyēnēnd ciš ī frārōn²⁹".

12. kē ō awēšān abar hān ī stōd gōwīšn srōd ēstēd kū pad Gāθān guft ēstēd kū "ēdōn abāg kē ī tō hēm [kū tō xVēš hēm] amān ēn Frašgīrd kunišn andar axVān"³⁰.

13. ud abar hamēšag hanjamanīh ī Amahraspand abar kardan ī tan ī pasēn³¹.

25 ptmyhstn; West 1892, 243 n. 5: "lakhvar petamī-hastanō (or petam-gāstanō)", i.e., *abāz payamThastan / *payamgāstn.

26 Cf. PY 30.8b: ēdōn ōhrmazd kē ō tō xVdāyīh aš Wahman be dahēd [mīzd], "Thus, ōhrmazd, it is you to whom Wahman gives rulership [reward]"

27 Here axVān / ahū²⁷ may mean something like "Archons", compare Mandēan 'almayyē, both "worlds, existences" and "evil aions".

28 A more recent form, instead of the standard *wirēxt.

29 Cf. the first gloss to PY 30.1c: [kē ciš ī frārōn menēd aš kirbag ī yazīšn meh bawēd], "[one who thinks virtuous things, the merit for his worship will be great]".

30 Actually, in PY 30.9a it is said: ēdōnēz amāh kē tō hēm [kū tō xVēš hēm amān] ēn Frašgīrd kunišn andar axVān, "thus, too, we are those who you (are) [i.e., we are yours own], to produce this Renovation in the existences".

31 Cf. PY 30.9b: ōhrmazd hān ī hamāg hanjamanagīh barišn ī Ašwahišt [kū.šān hamēšag hanjaman abar tan ī pasēn kunišn], "Ōhrmazd's holding entire gathering of Ašwahišt [they always have gathering regarding the production of the Final Body]".

10. And the sending of rulership and Avestan wisdom, by Ōhrmazd, for salvation³² of the creatures, and delegating again and again³³, whereby wounds and harm *were caused to the dēws, and restoring of rulership to Ōhrmazd, and they possess the reward of Wahman and the support of Gods³⁴; and the sovereignty, in the end, of men over dēws, the good over the evil, and the righteous over the wicked; and also about the nature of those who are producing the Renovation.

11. And this, too, that (there is) revealed: "They are those, O Zoroaster Spitāmān! who shall produce the Renovation, they have escaped among the *ahu*-lords³⁵, they are vigilant³⁶ in seeking righteousness and gentle-voiced, and, as regards righteousness in thought, they make righteous virtuous things".

12. About those praised it is recited, i.e., it is said in the Gāθas: "Thus, we are with those who are yours [i.e., we are yours own], this Renovation in the existences must be produced by us".

13. And about the perpetual gathering of the Bountiful Immortals regarding the production of the Final Body.

32 Here bōzāgīh clearly means "the office", or "the function", of a *bōzāg, "redeemer, one who preserves the creatures from the Assault".

33 West 1892, 243: "the recurrence of the mission", referring in n. 6 to the future Saviors.

34 An ech of this passage could be seen perhaps in Dk 9.35.12: xVānēd ābīstan ī mardom az yazdān ayāft rāy, "one calls for the boon of support (?) from God(s) for humans".

35 West 1892, 243: "they have escaped among the existences".

36 The context is so suggestive that one cannot not recall Trīn qaddīšīn of Daniel 4.10,20 and the *egregori* of the subsequent Enochic literature.

14. This, too, that the extender of the days of those who defeat the lying army and put on the shining light, and those make well to themselves⁴², who are the priest, the warrior, the husbandman, and the ruling man, with whom are Ahrišwang and the mēnōg ("spirit") of generosity, and they think with good-thinking and peace, and with peace to themselves, they give the world into the command of Ohrmazd and Ašwahišt, too, when they keep Ohrmazd and the Religion as a ruler.

15. And this, too, that one who keeps his thinking (to be) through the authority of the vital force, always thinks that which is righteous, and his sagacity increases.

16. And about the advice to people regarding 3 things, through which there will be the Renovation and prosperity of creations, (i.e.,) to seek the true religion, to abstain from sinning towards creations, to strive for the benefit of people.

17. Abadth ahīyāth pahlon hast.

14. enaz kū be wāxšēnīdar ī rōzān ī hān ī drōzan škenēnd spāh³⁷ ud paymōzēnd hān ī šēd rōšnīh ud hānaz ī nēwag tan warzišn kē awēšān hend ārdn, artēštar, wasrōš, mard ī x'adāy, kēšān abāg hast Ahrišwang³⁸ ud mēnōg ī radth, [ud] awēšān pad humenīšn³⁹ ud rāmīšn mēnēnd, [ud] pad rāmīšn ō x'ēš dahēnd gēhān pad hān ī ōhrmazd sālārīh ud Ašwahištaz⁴⁰, ka ōhrmazd ud dēn pad x'adāyīh dārend.

15. ud enaz kū-š menīšn pad dastwar ī ax' dāred hamēšag hān ī frōdn mēnd uš frāznagīh abzāyēd⁴¹.

16. ud abar andarz ī ō mardomān pad 3 cīs kē padīš bawēd Frāgīrd ud dāmān nēwag rawīšnīh, dēn ī rāst x'āstān, az wināhīšn ī dāmān pahlēxtān, pad nēwagīh ī mardomān lū[x]šīdan.

17. Abadth ahīyāth pahlon hast.

37 Cf. PY 30.10a: ēdōn pad hān dāhīšn [pad tan ī pasēn] awe ī drōz [ī gānāg mēnōg] pad frōd bawīšnīh [kās cīs de ō nīzārīh estād] škenīhēd spāh, "thus in this creation [in the Final Body] this har [the Stinking Spirit] will be annihilated [when his business will stand in feebleness], (his) army will be smitten". Here spāh stands for Avestan spāllāgra-, n, AIW 1612b, "Crfo", etc., while it is but phonetic resemblance that connects two words.

38 The standard rendering of ašī personified.

39 The Dk version contains here a mistake: humenīšnīh < "numenīšnīh of the PY version, which renders Avestan hūstīōiš, "good dwelling". Cf. PY 30.10b: ēdōn tēz āyōzēnd [ō mīzd stādān] hān ī pad humenīšnīh ī wāhman [ka pad frōdnīh mādīd] istān estēnd, "thus swiftly they yoke [to taking the reward] this, which is in the good dwelling of Wāhman [when they keep remaining in righteousness]".

40 Cf. PY 30.10c: ō ōhrmazd ud Ašwahišt [āyōzēnd] kē kunēnd hān ī wēh nāmīgīh [kē hān kas šawēd ō mīzd stādān kē husrāw bawēd], "to ōhrmazd and Ašwahišt [yoke/strove] those who win good name [i.e., that man will go to take the reward, who will be of good fame]".

41 Cf. PY 30.9c: kē ašar menīšn pad dastwarīh ī ax'ān dāred] aš anōh frāznagīh hast [kū frāzām ī cīs pad frōdnīh be dānēd] andar mīyān, "one who has concentrated mind [i.e., one who keeps his thinking through the authority of ritual forces], he has there sagacity [i.e., he knows the end of things through virtue] in the middle".

[TEXT VI] Y 31.18-19:

Y 31.18

mā.ciš aī vō draguātō mārəscā gūštā sāsnašcā
 āzī damānəm vīsem sōīerəm daxlīdum ā dāī
 dušītācā marəkaēcā aōā īš sāzduṃ snalōišā,

Let no (adherent) of the deceitful one listen to your mantras and teaching. For he renders house, village, county, and land uninhabitable and ruined. Teach them therefore with your weapon⁴³.

PY 31.18:

mā kaš edōn az šmāh az awē druwand māns^{ar} niyō[x]šād hammoxtišn
 [kū az ahlāmōy Abistāg ud Zand mā niyō[x]šād]
 cē andar hān dām wīs šusr deh dahēd
 dušrawišnTh ud margīh [hān ī ahlāmōy] edōn awēšān [ahlāmōyān rāy]
 sazēd snēh,

Let no one thus among you listen (in order) to learn the māns^{ar}(s) from this deceiver [i.e., do not listen Avesta and Zand from heretic]

for in this creation⁴⁴, village, semen⁴⁵, land (he) renders

misbehavior and death [this heretic], thus make (you) weapons (against) them [against the heretics].

⁴³ Translation by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 37.

⁴⁴ dām may be a "learned translation-transcription" of the Avestan damānəm, and was translated accordingly ("maison") in Molé 1963, 216.

⁴⁵ If not a "learned translation-transcription" of the Avestan sōīerəm, "county" (cf. the previous note), šusr could be a mistranslation. Molé 1963, 216 rendered it according to the Avestan meaning ("canton").

Y 31.19

gūštā yō manṭa ašəm ahūm.biš vīduuš ahurā
 arəžuxdāī vacaṇham hizuuš vasō
 oša šōrā suxrā mazdā vanḥau vidātā ranliyā,

The healer of existence, the knowing one who conceives truth, has listened (to your teaching). At will he is in control of his tongue for the sake of the correct uttering of the words, at the distribution of the balances in the good (way) with your red fire, O Mazda Ahura⁴⁶.

PY 31.19

niyōxsišnTh kē paymān ī ahlāyīh padəš pad har ax^{van} edōn āgāh ōhrmazd
 [kū hān kē paymān ī ahlāyīh padəš ciš ī mənōg ud getīg danēd kardan]
 arəuxt gōwišn awē ī pādixšay [ī abē bēm] pad uzwān kamagenišn [kūš ōh
 gōwišn ī rāst ī frārdn abāyīstan bē barišn]
 ed ī tō āta[x]š ī suxr ī ōhrmazd wizārišn bē dahēd paykārdrān [kū /kš
 bōxt ud ēraxī paydāg bē kunēnd],

It must be listened to by one in whom there is the measure of righteousness that in both existences thus Ōhrmazd is wise [i.e., one in whom there is the measure of righteousness, he will know to perform spiritual and worldly things]

he is the master of the rightly spoken word [without fear] through controlling (his) tongue [because this is how he must carry out the correct and righteous word]

this red fire of Thine, of Ōhrmazd, will give the fighters the redemption [i.e., they will reveal (both) the saved and the condemned].

⁴⁶ Translation by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 37.

[TEXT VII] Dk 9.31.22-24;

22. ud andarz ī ō mardomān abar pahrēz ī az pasTh ī awē ī ahlamōy nē
niyōxšīdan ud nē xVastan⁴⁷ ī azāš Yazdān Abistāg ud Zand. ud dušbarīšnTh
ud spazgīh ud an.āstīh ud margīh ud bēm ī az ahlamōyān andar gēhān.

23. ud andarz ī ō dēnburdārān abar cārag ī ahlamōyān bē šnāxtan ūšān sneh
sāxtan ud dāštan, kū hān ī pādixšāy ī abē bēm rāst.gōwišnTh niyāzagtar.
ka.š Dēn ī Ohrmazd dōštā ēgāš rāst.gōwišnTh ud abārtg ahlāyTh kāmāgēnīd
bawēd.

24. ud rasīdan ī pad stōš pad passāxt ata[x]š ī abzōnīg ō ayārTh ud bōzāgTh
ī ahlawān ud šewan rawīšnTh awē kē mard ī ahlaw frēbēd ud bēšēd ud nīdan
ī druwandān xvēš abāyīstan kardan ō dušaxv.

22. And the advice to men to abstain themselves from following that heretic, not to listen to him
and not to learn⁴⁸ from him the Avesta and Zand of God(s). And (occurring of) misconduct,
slander, strife, death, fear in the world through heretics⁴⁹.

23. And the advice to the faithful ones about knowing the ways of heretics and making and keeping
weapons against them, for one who is authorized and fearless, is more fond of truthful speaking.
When he loves the Religion of Ohrmazd, then he will be forced to truthful speaking and other
righteousness.

24. Also about the arrival to the assistance and salvation of the righteous, in the fourth morning
after death, through preservation of the propitious fire; and the movements of the lamentation of
him who deceives and vexes a righteous man, and leading the wicked by their own fitting deeds to
Hell.

47 Or: xVāstan.

48 Or: "to desire, to acquire".

49 Translated in West 1892, 250, and Molé 1963, 216-217.

Mardān Farrax^v son of Ohrmazddād, called by Zaehner "the only Zoroastrian philosopher", left after him a treatise, one feature of which is a rationalistic (and hostile) exposition of other faiths. In the chapters dealing extensively with Jews (SGW 13-14) there are numerous quotations from the Jewish Bible and some intriguing references to Talmudic stories.

The textual tradition is extremely poor, as SGW has reached us only in Pāzand, i.e., Middle Persian transcribed in Avestan letters, resulting in frequent corruptions which leave room to conjectures which are not necessarily correct. Because of the philosophical merits of the text, it was translated early into Sanskrit, which version is sometimes of use, enabling us to have a better understanding of the text. Thus, it was perhaps through the anti-Jewish passages of SGW that some small portions of the Jewish Bible were first translated into Sanskrit.

The text was edited in Jamasp-Asana & West (1887); translated in West 1901; a valuable transcription and annotated translation is by de Menasce 1947a, which still remains the standard source of reference; the "Jewish chapters" were translated in Darmesteter 1889; Neusner 1963; they were treated in West 1896, 106-7; Gray 1905 & 1906; Tavadia 1956, a 92-7; Shaked 1990a; Gikyō 1991; and by other scholars.

One of the questions arising while checking the Biblical quotations provided by Mardān Farrax^v in the ninth century CE is, what was his source?

Was it a Jewish or a Christian Bible? Did he procure the translation(s) by himself from the original language(s) or, did he resort to existing translation(s)?

If the answer to the second question is "yes", then was it in Middle Persian or was it, recalling the fact that he wrote in the ninth century, in Early New Persian? Was it derived from a copy used by Jews/Christians, or from a polemical treatise of his forerunner? (E.g., we know that under Kawād and Anūšīrwān written treatises were presented to the King of Kings by various religious communities (cf. Crone 1991, 30);

cf. de Menasce

were the quotations provided from one of these treatises submitted by Jews/Christians to expose their faith for the authorities?). And was it in the Pahlavi script or in another system of writing? And, lastly, is it correct to project the situation of the ninth century CE (when we can be sure that there were Judæo-Persian texts of Biblical books) into the situation of the fifth-seventh centuries, *i.e.*, can we state that what we find in SGW 13-14 are actually the remnants of a Sasanian Jewish Middle-Persian text?¹ Here I edit anew some of the passages of SGW 13-14, which were earlier identified as Biblical quotations. The text is given here in the "ideal" transcription based on that used by MacKenzie 1967 & 1971, with some small variations; some of the emendations are mine, some were proposed by earlier scholars. The text begins:

13.1-2: did, abar hambāsānīh ud *zēfan.gōwīšnīh ī naxustēn niwēgāš Azād xVānēnd ūš hamōgēn padēš hamdādestān hēnd kū Yazad pad xVēš dast nibīšt ō Mošē[h] dād. kū cīyōn purr ērang az har dušīh ud az was īš andar nihang ēw āgāhīh ī šmāh rāy ēdar paydāgēnōm. Gōwēd pad bun ī niwēg kū fradom būd zamīg ī *awērān² ud *tuhīg³ ud tārīkīh *ābar⁴ āb ī sīyāh ud waxš ī Yazad abar rōy ī hān āb ī sīyāh hamē *niwāzēd. Pas Yazad guft kū: "bād rōšnīh!"⁵, ud būd rōšnīh. ūš *abēr *nēwag *sahist hān rōšnīh. ūš wizārd rōšnīh ō rōz ud tārīkīh ō šab. ūš pas 6 rōz āfrīd gehān ud asmān ud zamīg, cē andar 7-om rōz haspēn ud āsān būd; pad hān ham rāz nūnāz Juhūdān rōz ī Sanbat *haspēnēnd⁶.

2 One of the most problematic words in the whole of the Jewish chapters of SGW. The Pāzand has āw xūn, explained by Darmesteter as "le persan *ab khūn*, le où l'eau croupit" and translated as "formant une lie aux eaux stagnantes"; emended by West to *afām*, "without form"; de Menasce: "āw-xūn, le chaos"; Neusner: "dark water" (seeing here ūn). My own solution: *[p]wyrn (*[a]wīrān, wīr), easily read as āw-xūn.

3 Pāzand tān, compared by de Menasce to (and read as) "np. tān, bouche", and rendered "l'abîme"; Neusner: tan, "unformed substance". I emend to *tuhīg; another possibility is to see tān as a corruption of *tōm, "evil darkness", or of *tār, which then must be taken as a hendiadys, tār ud tārīkīh. Vatican Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1964-5, 269 has: wryn zmyr bwd wyrn wtwy.

4 AP i < *pr.

5 Compare SGW 13.86, 94: bāš ud būd, "be and it was".

6 Pāzand: aspīmand. hasp-, "to rest, repose", cf. Henning 1933a (Verbum). 199 n.1; Boyce 1977, 47; Tafazzoli? 1991, 199-200, compare also MacKenzie 1971, 43 (haspīn, "rest, repose" as a substantive, note the adjective use a few words above). It seems now that we know the genuine Pahlavi-Jewish word which used to render the Hebrew/Aramaic šābāt/šābat (Hebrew original for *haspēn* ud āsān būd is šābāt wayyīnāgēš). Was the choice dictated by the phonetic similarity of *haspēn* and šābāt?

1 Some of these questions were asked by Darmesteter 1889, 5, but left unanswered.

Obviously, as has been noted by all students of this text, it is an abridged version of Genesis 1-2. Almost all the verses quoted were quoted exactly and according to the Jewish exegesis (note especially the case of the S'GW version (emended by me) of Gen 1.2, where Hebrew *lōhū wāhū* was rendered according to the traditional Jewish understanding, not according to the LXX). The special stress on that "He separated the Light [for the day] and the Darkness [for the night]" (while the Hebrew dictum is different) may indicate that it was important, from the point of view of the author of the *Vorlage* of the text before the eyes of Marḏān Farrāx^v, to prove that the night, too, was supposed to be created by the Jewish God, at odds with the Zoroastrian view. This point makes it seem plausible that the *Vorlage* in question was a part of a Jewish treatise provided at the request of the Sasanian authorities.

Another indication leading in the same direction is the use of *rāz* (though the word can be read otherwise), "mystery", as the reason given why the Jews keep Sabbath. The use of this Pahlavi word (borrowed in Hebrew and Aramaic from Iranian at a very early stage) in Zoroastrian texts was referred to in Shaked 1969a as reflecting some esoteric trends, so it may be plausible to suggest that using this word would have been seen by Jews exposing their religion to Zoroastrians as a sufficient explanation why they keep the Sabbath, a practice perceived by Zoroastrians as harmful to *qehān ābādīth*, "protection and promotion of the created world"¹².

8 Rendered as *svatantra*, "free", by the Sanskrit version. Darmesteter 1889, 5 and n. 2: "Saint-Écriture, *ajāt*, persan *āzād*, littéralement *libre et noble*"; West 1901, 208: *āzād*, de Menasce 1947a, 182-3: *āzāt*, Écriture, seeing in the extant Pāzand text a false reading of **ōraytāk*

12 This Zoroastrian concept, in turn, probably made some impact on the Jewish idea of $\text{yīššūq} \text{ šel } \text{šō'im}$ (Sh. Shaked, orally), where yīššūq is a calque of one of the meanings of the Iranian šōdūt . My friend Michael Schneider called my attention to the fact that the expression rāz dēšabbā'ā occurs in Zohar and in Sabbath prayers; though the age of the Zohar texts is problematic, our expression in SGW can be used here in the discussion, as it may reflect older usage.

10 This notion appears in Mandaita (using an Iranian loan word!) as *mia slauia*, cf. Darmesteter 1889, 6 n. 1; de Menasce 1947a, 194; Jonas 1963, 99; Drower & Macuch 1963, 265, 323.

11 Or, "for this reason", if one reads *pad hăn ham *răy*.

The choice of the Iranian *waxš* to render the Hebrew *ruḥ*, "spirit, ghost, etc.; wind" was dictated by the Zoroastrian terminology, in which *waxš* "(prophetic) speech", and its homonyms have important theological connotations¹³; the stress is on creation by the word, and such a tradition should be connected to those of the Aramaic *mēmṛā* of the Targumim, and of the Jewish Hellenistic *λόγος*¹⁴. Interestingly, the Jewish translator did not choose the Pahlavi *wād*, "wind", as the equivalent for the Hebrew *ruḥ* (as was done in Christian Sogdian, zpṛt *wāt*). The reason was perhaps the fact that in the Zoroastrian tradition the notion of *wād* has a rather ambivalent character.

It is significant that in the New Persian Jewish version, it is nevertheless *bād*, "wind", that translates the Hebrew *ruḥ*¹⁵, and I believe, this became possible only in an environment where Muslim notions, and not the Zoroastrian ones, were dominant.

There is an indication in the text of the passage from the Zoroastrian days'-counting to that existing in New Persian. It is not impossible that the change took place in the Late Sasanian epoch, earlier than the Muslim impact became possible, cf. SGW 13.101:

cē gōwēnd kūš xʷaršēd rōz ī caḥārom ī xʷad caḥār.šunbat dād, "they say that the Sun was created on the fourth day, i.e., in the fourth of the Sabbath (Wednesday)" [cf. Gen 1.14-19].

Another SGW passage leads one to believe that some of the quotations derive from an inner Jewish text, as they would be seen offensive to Zoroastrian tenets (and are indeed ridiculed by Mardān Farrax^v). Cf. SGW 14.5-8, which deserves a special analysis, as it entitles one to suggest that there was a continuation from the Jewish Bible translations into Middle Persian up to New Persian. Here reference will be made to two important Judæo-Persian Torah MSS from the 14th century, the Vatican and London Pentateuchs, both published by Paper. SGW 14.5-8 is as follows:

¹³ On this word, cf. de Menasce 1947a, 75.

¹⁴ Cf. SGW 14.12: *ud waxš clyōn rōd ī *arwand*, "and His spirit like a rushing / valiant (in Pahlavi the name of a river) river" [Isaiah 30.28, *warūhō kanahāl šōtēq*], compare Judæo-Persian version published in de Lagarde 1884, 28: *w'mr ʔwy ʔwn rwd syrr kwnʔ*, with *ruḥ* = *ʔamr*, "saying, order".

¹⁵ Noted by Darmesteter 1889, 6 n. 2, who, however, thought that "*vakhsh* est certainement une corruption orthographique du pehlvi pour *vāt* le vent".

Man hom *Adōnay ī kēn.xʷān ud kēn.tōz ud kēn ī haft

*āwādag¹⁶ pad frazandān tōzom, ūm *bē¹⁷ kēn nē frāmōšīd,

"I am Adonay who is vengeance-seeking and vengeance-repaying and I pay the vengeance of the seven generations through the children, and I never forgot (this) vengeance".

Here *kēn.xʷān* ud *kēn.tōz* translates the Hebrew *lī nāqām wəšillēm* (Deuteronomy 32.35). It is not without interest for this study that the verse was quoted in Romans 12.19 as if it read *lī nāqām *wəššallēm*, and it is important to note that the quotation in SGW reflects the Massoretic text.

Vatican Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1964-5, 106:

dr pyš man mwkʔrʔt wmn bʔz twzm;

London Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1972, 184-5:

mr ʔst kyn ngʔh dʔštn wkyn twxtn,

where the second verbal root used is the same as in the SGW quotation.

The Judæo-Persian texts here follow the Targūms (*qdmy pwrʔnwʔtʔdydy hyʔ nqmtʔ*); SGW quotation may be seen as derived from an unvocalized text: **naqqām wəšallēm*, but a similarity is found in the so-called Targūm .Yarūšalmī: *wʔnʔ hwʔ dmšlm*. Compare also Nahum 1.2: *ʔl qānnōʔ wəndōqēm* etc.

Ex. 20.5:

ʔl qānnō pōqēd ʔawōn ʔāhšt ʔal bānīm ʔal šillēšīm wəʔal rībbēʔtm
lāšōnəʔay,

Vatican Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1965, 103 (not available in London Pentateuch):

¹⁶ Transcribed according to MacKenzie 1971, 13. On this word cf. Shaki 1988; in our SGW text the word was rightly conjectured by de Menasce in his edition (cf. also p. 202, contrary to l. 7); the objections made in Neusner 1963, 288, and n. 26 (quoting de Menasce's **šbādaa*, "génération", as "de Menasce emends OBADAA to APATAK, descendants") cannot stand.

¹⁷ The text has *bun*. *ʔ* and *ʔ* are very similar in the Pahlavi script.

xwd'y kyn'wr 'qwb't kwn' gwn'h-pdr'n-p'r-pwsr'n-p'sy'n-p'r-d'r¹⁸ shwmy'n
w'br d'r' čh'rmy'n bdwšmn d'r'nn mn.

Ex. 34.7:

pšqēd 'āwōn 'ābōt 'al bānīm w'al banēy bānīm 'al šillēšīm w'al
ribbē'im,

Vatican Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1965, 125:

'qwb't kwn' gwn'h pdr'n 'b'r pwsr'n w'br pwsr'n pwsr'n 'sy'n 'br d'r'
shwmy'n w'br d'r' čh'rmy'n.

The end of the passage is problematic; it has been suggested that it translates wənaqqēh lō' ynaqqēh from the beginning of Ex 34.7, which is itself very difficult. The Targūmī's paraphrasing include notions of "I forgive those who repent and I punish those who do not", and the like, reflected also in Vatican Pentateuch, cf. Paper 1965, 125: 'mwrz' 'nčy b'z grd'n b'wryt' 'wy w'nčy b'z grd'n ny 'byz' kwn'. The Hebrew NQY was rendered here, with right, as both "to forgive" ('mwrz') and "to clear, make pure" ('byz' kwn'). I am moved by this to suggest an emendation in the SGW text, reading ūm *bē kēn nē *frā[z] *āmurzīd, "and I will never forgive (this) vengeance", though I do not know of any examples of the use of frā[z] with āmurzīdan¹⁹.

A genuine Judæo-Pahlavi text (find identifiable in SGW 14.33, where Gen 6.6 is quoted: wayyinnāḥam YHWH kī 'āsāh 'aē hā'ādām bā'arēs wayyit'asšēb 'ael libbō):
ciyōn ēn t gōwēd kū *zārīgēn tā būd ūš guft kū pašēmān hom pad kardan t
mardomān pad zamīg,

"As (the text) states that He became so sorrowful until He said "I repent for making men in the earth".

¹⁸ An Aramaic word for "generation".

¹⁹ Professor Shaked suggested, tentatively: ūm *pad kēn nē *āmurzēm, for *wngm l' 'nch.

The London and Vatican Pentateuchs do not provide here anything interesting (as they, especially the London Pentateuch, contain mostly Arabic words, and follow closely the Targūmī'm); but it is perhaps of interest that the Standard Persian Bible published by the British Bible Society reads ve xodāvand pešīmān šod.

SGW 14.19-20 is a quotation from Ps 95.10. Unfortunately, we have no old Judæo-Persian translations of Psalms, but the Christian Pahlavi translation from Turfan does provide a parallel; West and de Menasce emended a scabbled word *asarašara* into *Isrāšān, but, as Neusner 1963, 288 n. 24, notes, this is unnecessary, and his emendation to "generation" (*āwādag, according to the Turfan version (pad hān āwād, "in this generation", Andreas & Barr 1933, 9), is better:

40 sāl abar *āwādag pad xēšm būd hom ūš guft kū *wiyāftag²⁰ dīl hēnd
āwādag,

"40 years I was angry with (this) generation, and He says that the generation/race²¹ is of
perverted heart".

The Hebrew text reads here: 'arbā'im šānāh 'āqūt baddōr wā'ōmar 'am tō'ey
lēbāb hēm.

It is worth noting that here we have an indication that the quoted text was unvocalized: ūš
guft kū renders Hebrew w'mr (MT: wā'ōmar) which was understood as wā'ōmar, "he
said", or *wā'ōmēr, "(he is) saying" (or even wayyōmēr, "He said").

²⁰ Unfortunately, the word corresponding to *wiyāftag was not preserved in the Turfan version, cf. Andreas & Barr 1933, 9, and Taf. 2 Bl. 2: ['arbā'im šānīn mā'ent it bēdārā' haw wā'emrē
dā'ammā' haw dā'ā'e libbāhōn], 40 SNT rēškanē būdam pad ZK āwād 'pm guftē 'yK
ram ē HWHnd MNWšān ... dīlē.

²¹ Both renderings are possible.

The "Jewish" chapters of SGW make reference to other Jewish traditions, including those derived from the Talmud, Midrash, and other Biblical books, besides the much-read Pentateuch and Psalms. Only a couple of examples will be given here. Compare a clear reference to Isaiah 37.36 in SGW 14.29: *kūš pad ēwag šab 160,000 az gund ī spāh ī Māzandarīgān pad wad *margīh ēzad*, "As He slew, with a bad death, in one night 160,000 people of the Māzandarian army"; the Sennacherib army is said to have counted 185,000 men.

The impact of a Midrash or a glossed Targūm of the type of Pseudo-Jonathan could be seen in SGW 14.30²²⁻³¹: *ud hān jār ēw 600,000 mard jud az zan ud rēdag ī aburnāy az *Isrāēlān andar wiyābān ēzad, bē dō mard ī bē rāst hēnd*, "and on another occasion He slew 600,000 men besides women and young children of the Israelites in the desert, except two men who were righteous".

It is impossible to end without saying a few words about the quotations from the Christian texts found in SGW. Much more room was allotted in SGW (two "Jewish" chapters with their total of 237 lines, as against one "Christian" chapter with its 155 lines) to the anti-Jewish polemics, than to those directed against the Christians. Besides the quotations from the Jewish Bible referred to above, the text also contains numerous others. This is not the case with the quotations from the New Testament: only a few are found (cf. de Menasce 1947a, 223-4), and the Old Testament quotations far outnumber those from the New Testament. Another point of comparison is that while the most quoted Old Testament text is Genesis, then Exodus and Psalms, there are 11 quotations from John and only 8 from the Synoptic Gospels, plus one from Romans. While the Old Testament quotations are, largely, exact and correct, most of the New Testamental ones are textually rather problematic, even the Lord's Prayer²³ (SGW 15.148-150).

²² Cf. Bailey 1933-5, 70.

²³ Cf. Casarelli 1900, 253-4. In the version of SGW it is a paraphrase of Mt 6.9,11,13: *pidareman pad asman lacuna at b[aw]ad šahriyārīh ūt ē b[aw]ad kām pad zamīg ciyōn pas asman lacuna ō mān deh nān ī rōzgārīh lacuna *u.mān mā bar ō gumāngārīh*. Note *rōzgārīh* for [ἀγρον τιμωρ] τὸν ἐκπορεύον, Syriac [lahmā] dāsūnqānan yāwmānā, and *gumāngārīh* for [ἐκ παραπορεύον] nisyōnā.

CHAPTER III

III

APPENDIX II

Fragān

TD2 18.3-19.5, Bd 1a.6:

*nazdist asmān dād, rōšn ud paydāg¹, *ī abēr dūr.*kanārag², xāyag.dēs³, xVān.āhēn ī hast gōhr almāst⁴, nar⁵. ūš sar pad⁶ ō asar rōšn paywast; ūš dām hamē andarōn⁷ ī asmān bē dād, hambān⁸ humānag *ayāb drubušt *kūš⁹ har abzār ī pad kō[x]šīšn andar abāyast, andarōn nihād ēstēd, ayāb mān [*hu]mānag, kē har ciš andar mānēd. fragān *ī bun ī asmān candīh pahnāy īš drahnāy, candīh drahnāy *īš¹⁰ bāīy, candīh bāīy īš zahyāy, hamōg handāz¹¹ *hu.fasār¹²; warzwar humānag¹³ menīšnōmand, gōwīšnōmand, kunīšnōmand, āgāh, abzōnīg, wīzīdar, mēnōg ī asmān. ūš padīrīft drang drubuštīh az Gannāg Mēnōg, kū abāz dwāristan nē hīšt, ciyōn gurd ī artēštār kē zrēh paymōxt ēstēd, *kē¹⁴ abē bēmīhāz az karezār *bōxt¹⁵, mēnōg ī asmān asmān ēdōn dārēd. ūš dād ō ayārīh ī asmān Urwāhmanīh, cēš Urwāhmanīh padēš, frāz brēhēnīd, cē¹⁶ nūnāz andar gumēzagīh, dām pad Urwāhmanīh andar mānēd.*

¹ pyt'kyh.

² Anklesaria 1956, 23: *ayēgīha*, "of steel".

³ *xāyag.dēs*, "egg-shaped", etymologically connected to *āvyā-, "egg", and to vī-, "bird" (Avestan *yāθa vīš* *aēm*, cf. Henning 1954c), together with the reference to the shape of *andarōn*, "inner part" of the sky, may rest on an old Avestan tradition (cf. Henning 1954, and Bailey 1971, xxviii & 127; compare Bailey 1943, 128 n. 3 [on p. 129]).

⁴ On *almās* < ἀδάμας, both "diamond" and "steel", cf. Bailey 1943, 133-4 [< Akkadian *elmešū* > Hebrew *hallāmīš*, "flint", Arabic *halnabūs*, "firestone"].

⁵ "Sky" is masculine in Iranian, and belongs to the realm of the male *yazata* *Šahrēwar*.

⁶ Bailey 1943, 140: *bē*.

⁷ Cf. the note to *xāyag.dēs*.

⁸ Bailey 1943, 140 and n. 1: "[like] a building"; Zaehner 1955, 318: "[like] a castle". Anklesaria 1956, 23: "resembling a bag", cf. MacKenzie 1971, 39: "skinbag", cf. also Draxt ī *Asōrīg* 42.

⁹ MNWS.

¹⁰ APŠ.

¹¹ Nyberg 1974, 151a: *parqān* ... *pahnāi* ī *damīk*; *pēramōn* Harburz, "H. is a *waj* all around it".

¹² Zaehner 1955, 283, 307: **hupatsāy*. Or, is it connected to Manichaean Middle Persian *ubdār*, "crucified", in the sense "square" or the like?

¹³ Anklesaria 1956, 22-3, read and translated the last 5 words as **hamōg a.wiyābān ud fasār ud razōr humānag*, "is entirely like the desert, the chasm and the forest", which makes little sense.

¹⁴ AYK.

¹⁵ *bwhyt*.

¹⁶ MNW.

First, He created the Sky, bright and manifest, with extremely remote boundaries, in the shape of an egg, of shining metal that is the substance of steel, male¹⁷, whose top¹⁸ was connected to the Endless Light; His whole creation was created within the Sky, like a skin bag *or a fortress, wherein every implement/weapon needed for the battle is laid, or like a house, in which everything remains/is kept. The foundation of the base of the Sky¹⁹: its width is equal to its length, its length is equal to its height, its height is equal to its depth²⁰, wholly equal²¹, *well-constrained²²; like a husbandman, the mēnōg of the Sky is thinking, speaking, acting, knowing, bountiful, discriminating²³. He accepted (the task of being in the function of) durable fortification against the Stinking Spirit, i.e., that he (the mēnōg of the Sky) would not let him (the Stinking Spirit) to rush again; like a hero warrior²⁴, clad in his armor, saved without fear from the battle, so the mēnōg of the Sky thus preserves the sky. And He created Joy/Delight to assist the Sky, for He fashioned Joy/Delight for this purpose, for even now, in the mingled state, the creation remains in Joy/Delight.

17 Zaehner 1955, 318; Anklesaria 1956, 23: "of shining steel, whose substance is of male diamond". Cf. also Bailey 1943, 128, 132. Compare Sābuhragān A r 17-18, MacKenzie 1979, 504-5: : ps xrdyšhr yzd h'n ky nxwst 'wy nr d'm, "then Xrdešahr (the god of the world of wisdom) who first that male creation...".

18 Note how different it became in PRDD 46.4.

19 Bailey 1943, 135 (and Williams 1990, II, 206): "of the basic boundary of the sky [the width]"; Zaehner 1955, 318; "the [bottom of the vault (reading parkān [bun], cf. Zaehner 1955, 307)] of the sky's [width]"; Anklesaria 1956, 22-3: *parkān bun ī Asmān candaš pahnāy, "the prop of the base of the Sky, [-whose width...].".

20 Zaehner 1955, 318; "depth"; Anklesaria 1956, 23: "capacity". The reading of this word, frequent in Bd, is uncertain. My reading (but not the interpretation) is closer to that of Zaehner 1955, 283, 361, and Nyberg 1974, 228a. In other cases in Bd, the word clearly belongs to the semantic field of "size" (compare Markwart 1938, 12; "stark"), not to that of "deep".

21 Williams 1990, II, 206.

22 Zaehner 1955, 318: "the proportions are the same and fit exceeding well (?)".

23 Perhaps accidentally, these (six) qualities correspond (roughly) to the five Limbs of the Manichaean Manohmed Rōšn (Reason, Mind, Intelligence, Thought, Understanding).

24 Note that the mēnōg of the Sky was compared above with a husbandman; it seems that the third element of the comparison (as is evident from the texts dealt with in the sub-chapter "Fire"), namely "priest", was omitted for some reason.

Bd 1a.6 is to be compared to PRDD 46.4²⁵, where Bailey 1943, 135, saw some impact of the Aristotle's doctrine:

ūš nazdist asmān az sar bē brēhēnōd ūš gōhr az *ābgēnag²⁶ ī spēd ūš pahnāy ud bālāy rāst ūš zahyāy²⁷ ī fragān hān and hast cand pahnāy ī *tuhīgth ūš winārīšn pad nar ī ahlaw ud Dahmān Afrīn ūš dāštārth ī gētīg nēst Ohrmazd abāg dām ud dahlīšn andar nīšīnēd.

"And first He created the Sky from the head, and its substance is white *crystal, and its width and height are equal. The depth of its foundation²⁸ is as much as the breadth²⁹ of the emptiness³⁰, and its management is by the righteous male and Dahmān Afrīn, and there is no physical support for it³¹; Ohrmazd resides within (it) with the creatures and the creation".

This passage forms a part of the so-called "Strange Account of the World's Origin" (cf. Williams 1985), whose microcosm/macrocasm speculation has some points that resemble the Manichaean view of the world as created from the parts of the demons' bodies. What combines both above-quoted Pahlavi passages is, i.e., the notion of fragān, "foundation". This word is absent from Manichaean texts (as far as I know), but the Dēnkard (Dk 3.200.8(7), cf. Jackson 1932, 206-7, 214; Olsson 1991, 279, 282) uses it while discussing Manichaeism:

25 Edited in (also Tavadia 1931 (non vidi); partly transcribed and translated in Bailey 1943, 135; transcribed and translated in Zaehner 1955, 361, 365; edited in Nyberg 1962, 92, Williams 1985; Williams 1990, I, 160-1, II, 72, 206 (it is the last translation that was mainly adopted here).

26 For the reading, cf. Bailey 1943, 133. Zaehner 1955, 361, 363, 365: xēn, "crystal".

27 Williams: zahīh.

28 Bailey 1943, 135: "boundary".

29 Bailey, *ibid.*: "width".

30 Bailey, *ibid.*: "void". Zaehner 1955, 365, translated the whole phrase as: "and the depth of the surrounding wall is as great as the breadth of the Void".

31 Contrary to the Manichaean notion of Atlas.

ēwag padīrag hān ī ahlāyīh ārastār Adurbād gētīg buništāg rāy dāštan
handarzēnīd, druz xastag mānī fragān pad stūn ī Kundag Druz ud hānāš
buništāg drāyīdan dawist.

Contrary to that which the restorer of righteousness, Adurbād, declared, namely, to hold the world for the basic creation, the crippled demon Mānī clamoured that the foundation was in the pillar of the demon Kundag; and that, he pretended, was the basic cosmic principle³².

Fragān, "foundation", could indeed have been mentioned in a lost Middle Persian Manichaean text, and taken from such a text by the compiler of the anti-Manichaean passage in Dk; two suggestions could be made:

- 1), the supposed Manichaean text mentioning fragān goes back to Mani himself or to his close associates, and thus reflect a text of the "proto-Bundahishn" type, to which the Manichaean author deliberately made a reference;
- 2), the supposed Manichaean text mentioning fragān was of a much later date, and the notion of fragān was introduced into it, again, after the model of a known Zoroastrian text, in an secondary effort to provide a more "Zoroastrian" flavoring to the Manichaean writings.

It is common knowledge that the descriptions of the Manichaean doctrine coming from the Middle Eastern West of the Early Islamic period do not always provide the same picture of small details while compared with genuine Manichaean documents from Turfan³³. I think our Bd passage can explain the origin of a term in an-Nadīm's account. This Arabic-writing author probably used a Persian (or, rather, an Arabic one derived from the Persian) version of Manichaean writings, extremely close to the terminology of the *Zands* related to the *Vorlage* of Bd 1a.6, for he stated that the name of the Mother of Living, who proceeded to the Border (hadd = *wīmand) together with the Beloved of the Luminaries was Bahja/Bahīja (cf. Flügel 1862, 55.3, 88; Jackson 1932, 259; Dodge 1970, II, 780), "Joyfulness", which, no doubt, is

32 My translation is close to that of Jackson 1932, 207 ("to hold the world for an original creation"); Olsson 1991, 282: "to consider the material world as the basic cosmic principle". No doubt, under the "pillar" is meant "the Column of Glory/Praise", though its functions are different.

33 On Bar-Kōnay's material, cf. Sundermann 1993b, 312.

connected to Urwāhmanīh of our Bd passage, about which it is stated that even now the creatures (dām, i.e. the living) remain in Joy (Urwāhmanīh) to assist the Sky.

These are the military aspects of the scene described in Bd 1a.6 that recall of the known descriptions of the Manichaean cosmogony. The mēnōg of the Sky, "clad in his armor like a warrior", defends the male sky against the Assault of the Evil, reminiscent, to a certain degree, of the Manichaean First Man Ohrmīzd and his Five Resplendent Sons, whom he put on like armor (on armor and the Five elements, cf., e.g., Zaehner 1955, 118); the male sky in the Zoroastrian version, fortified like a military camp (drubuštīh)³⁴, recalls, at the same time, a "trap, for this seems to be the meaning of hambān, "skin bag", here³⁵, lest the Stinking Spirit may rush again to defile the world. It could hardly be accidental that those who fight back the attack of Evil in both Zoroastrian and the Manichaean versions are the mēnōg of the starry Sky and the Beloved of Luminaries (on another stage); Joy (Urwāhmanīh) was created, in the Zoroastrian version, to assist the Sky, and in the Manichaean version of the events, Mother of Living and the First Man were evoked by the Father of Greatness to protect the Realm of Lights.

I think this combined evidence is sufficient to suggest that the texts close to the Zoroastrian *Zands* referred to, especially, to the "proto-Bundahishn", were known to Mani and utilized by him while creating his own cosmogony.

34 In Manichaeism, too, the sun and the moon are sometimes called "the walled fortresses", cf. Boyce 1975, 6.

35 The "skin bag" was designed perhaps to catch into it the powers of evil and to tie them up there. Sahrīstānī (Cureton 1923, 184.16, cf. also Zaehner 1955, 434) speaks of the world as of a "net" (Arabic šabaka) for the Satan, which may reflect our "skin bag".

The beginning of this commentary in the *Waršt mānsār* Nask version as summarized in Dk 9.32, which is a very free paraphrase of PY 32, indicates that some possibly Manichaean teachings were known to the *Zandists*, who, not rejecting Monotheism outright, nevertheless fiercely defended the idea that the forces of evil which punish transgressors are not *Ōhrmazd's* agents. I think we cannot understand the fervor of Dk 9.32.1-3 unless we assume that what we find here is a result of the interaction of the traditional Zoroastrian exegesis with "Western" traditions. The point of Dk 9.32 is polemical, and we are thus entitled to suppose that these polemics are aimed against some controversial teachings that the *Zandists* had in mind, while producing a commentary which strays far from the text which it was supposed to clarify. There can be little doubt that the heretical or openly anti-Zoroastrian teaching which this Pahlavi *midrash* was composed to repudiate were the texts close or belonging to the type of literature surviving in the form of the Jewish Books of Giants, in their different versions (Qumranic fragments, Enochic books, medieval legends¹).

Some of Mani's compositions ultimately derived from these, as well as also, perhaps, from genuine non-"orthodox" Zoroastrian *Zands* or popular lore. The history of the Giants' literature in Semitic languages and its translations into the tongues of Manichaean and Christian traditions as a whole cannot, of course, be dealt with here. Nevertheless some remarks need to be made.

According to the Koranic tradition (*sūrah* 2.96), the devils revealed sorcery to two angels, Hārūt wa Mārūt, in Babylon, where Hārūt wa Mārūt were later suspended by the heels, as a punishment for their disobedience. According to another (Iranian) Islamic tradition, the couple was imprisoned and chained in a well in Mt. Dumbāw and², having been thus cast in the rôle of a double Aži Dahāka³. The Koranic text says⁴:

1 Milik 1976, 335-9, believed that the medieval legends on Semhazay and 'Azā'el represent a retroversion of fragments of Manichaean compositions, but cf. Greenfield & Stone 1979, 102. Cf. Stroumsa 1984, 167, and now Reeves 1992, 88.

2 Cf. Littmann 1916; Jung 1926, 129-130; de Menasce 1947b.

3 Cf. Russell 1987a, 381.

4 It is very interesting that the Koranic story about Hārūt wa Mārūt the seducers goes in the context of the (255) "Satanic Verses" (*sūrah* 2.100).

"And they followed after that what the Satans called for, against the Kingdom of Salomon, but Salomon [himself] became not an unbeliever, but the Satans did; they taught men magic and all that was revealed to the Angels (dual) in Babylon, [those whose names are] Hārūt and Mārūt, and they [dual] did not teach anybody until they say [dual]: "Behold, we are seduction and do not be an unbeliever!"; and they [men] learned from them [dual] that what divides between man and his neighbor, and they did not harm anybody but by God's permission, and they learned [from them] what does harm and does not benefit; and indeed they knew that this one who bought it, has no part in the future life; and if they only knew how much bad is that that they sold their souls for".

The stand of the Koranic version here is problematic: on the one hand, this version conforms to the strictly Monotheistic view, in the vein of the first two chapters of Job (Hārūt and Mārūt did not harm anybody except by God's permission); on the other, the task of Hārūt and Mārūt is to be the seducers of Allah, tempting weak souls and urging them to turn to their own free choice: "We are seduction and do not be an unbeliever!". In Muhammad's Monotheistic view here, Saytān is, indeed, an agent of Allah.

The *Dēn Kerd* text lies, as a whole, within Zoroastrian lore - the Evil Powers punish those who deserve to be punished, but they do not do God's job, and their power to punish is not from *Ōhrmazd*. In the Zoroastrian version, one has to discriminate between the functions of seduction and punishment. Within the complicated dualistic Zoroastrian *Weltanschauung*, with its clearly monotheistic overtones, this sounds well, but in the strictly Monotheistic version of Koran 2.96 one hears dissonant voices.

As to the Koranic passage in question, it seems that it was a Semitic version, Jewish or Christian, or even Manichaean⁵, that influenced Muhammad. The Iranian names of the Evil Angels, Hārūt wa Mārūt, and the Mesopotamian setting are among the most interesting features of the Koranic account: in this supposedly Semitic version the Evil Angels keep their Iranian names [which are not the names used in the Zoroastrian version], as a part of the demonization of the borrowed Zoroastrian angelology.

5 For criticism, cf. now de Blois 1995. For a new evaluation of the possible Manichaean impact on Muhammad, cf. now Simon 1998.

Ultimately, these are, of course, the names of the Zoroastrian Amaša Spānta-s, Haurvatāt and Amaratāt⁶; these two Yazatas are known also in Sogdian as hrwwt mrwwt, equated to Middle Persian *mwr]d⁷ hrwd⁸. As names of flower[s]⁸, they are well known in Armenian and Kurdish⁹. But why should two beneficent female Bountiful Immortals of the Zoroastrian tradition be cast in the rôle of Enochic Fallen Angels?

I believe there is no way to explain this paradox other than to assume that there was a Mesopotamian Syriac (Manichaean?) version of the Enochic motif which Semitized Iranian lore in an anti-Zoroastrian vein. The word "seduction" (Arabic fitna) used in this version has, in the Manichaean tradition, mostly encratic (anti-)sexual connotations, and is associated mostly with female seduction of males. The use of the earth-protecting Bountiful Immortals may reflect the Manichaean (theoretical) rejection of agriculture and serious limitations on permissible foods, with a special stress on some vegetables.

The Iranian names were interpreted in a Semitic tongue (Syriac?) as *Mārūtā, ܡܪܘܬܐ, "[evil] power" (compare Sahrēwar, "Desirable Power"), and *Hārūtā, ܚܪܘܬܐ, "evil thinking" (from HRR/HRHR)¹⁰ (cf. Y 32.3, Akoman, "Evil Mind").

In Avestan, the names Haurvatāt and Amaratāt are feminine, but in Western Middle Iranian there is no grammatical gender; in Syriac such abstract nouns are also feminine, but in Arabic they became masculine, normally falling within a pattern for loan words from Syriac feminine nouns like ܡܪܘܬܐ, ܚܪܘܬܐ that become masculine in Arabic. This is, in my opinion, how these male Fallen Angels of the Koran were conceived.

In the later Islamic tradition, according to the 14th century anti-Muslim treatise of the Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos [monk Joasaph], the angels 'Apōr and Mapōr were sent by God "to rule well and judge justly" (cf. Milik 1976, 110).

6 Dumézil 1945 reaffirmed the old view of de Lagarde about the Iranian origin of Hārūt wa-Mārūt, cf. also Bausani 1959, 141.

7 Cf. Henning 1940, 16.

8 Each of the 33 Yazatas is supposed to have its own flower, cf. Modi 1937, 437. Cf. also Bd 16a. 1-2: enez gōyēd kū har gul ē Amahraspand ē xveš hast...ud sūsān Xordād, ud camba Amurdād [xvēš]. "He also says that every Amahraspand has its own flower... Xordād has lily, and Amurdād has camba as her own"; Ankdesaria 1956, 152, left camba untranslated; New Persian čampā means "a kind of rice grown in Gilan".

9 Kurdish xorud-mordud, cf. Dumézil 1926; Henning 1965b, 251, n. 53; Russell 1987a, 375-390.

10 An Aramaic dialect of the type of Mandaic can be an intermediary as well. In Mandaic (Drower & Macuch 1963, 127a), haruta, though from Semitic HRR and unconnected to the original *HRR, means "freedom" > "licence, prostitution".

It is clear that the pair was seen by Christians as if perceived by Muhammedans as *angels* (as their Zoroastrian namesakes in fact are), rather than as *demons*. Alongside with the form 'Apōr and Mapōr, another Byzantine Greek form is attested as well, namely Apōθ and Mapōθ, with θ. In the Byzantine Abjuration formula we read: "I anathemize the angels called by Muhammad (Μωάμεδ) Apōθ and Mapōθ" (cf. Montet 1906, 150).

The names 'Apōr and Mapōr / Apōθ and Mapōθ, with -or / -θ for -ūt, correspond to the Arabic names Hārūt and Mārūt; this phonetic variant suggests the existence of an independent Byzantine tradition different from the Koranic one quoted. I suggest that the names familiar to Byzantines from their own tradition were substituted for those of their Koranic counterparts, whose history was different. In other words, the Koranic Hārūt and Mārūt and the Byzantine 'Apōr and Mapōr / Apōθ and Mapōθ go back to different recensions of the same story, which should be of some age. Besides these two reflections of the suggested tradition, we have a remnant in ZEnoch¹¹, or "Secrets of Enoch", now extant only in two Slavonic [Macedonian or Panonian] recensions, where we encounter Apioχ and Mapioχ.

Milik (*idem*) supposed that the Greek original of the Jewish "Secrets of Enoch" had *'Apōθ and *Mapōθ for Apioχ and Mapioχ, who invariably represent the same "Hārūt and Mārūt" tradition: "the oscillation of f < th (e.g. Sif, Seth...) and of ch (here Araf > Arach > Ariach) is peculiar to the phonetics of Greek borrowings into the eastern Slavonic languages (e.g. Fiodor and Chodor coming from Theodoros)".

This explanation is indeed very shrewd and sophisticated; however, the shift in question is the *mark of vulgar dialects and was never attested in writing; until the spelling reform after the Russian Revolutions of 1917*, θ was sustained in borrowings from Greek; the Slavonic and Russian Bibles have, e.g., Сидъ / Сидъ for Seth, or Ройъ for Ruth [pronounce Sif and Ruf].

In light of the attested Byzantine 'Apōr and Mapōr, besides 'Apōθ and Mapōθ, it seems plausible to suggest that Apioχ and Mapioχ go back to the Greek original that had another, third, form, namely *Apioχ and *Mapioχ, which were faithfully reproduced by the Slavonic translation. These unattested forms could be explained as a misreading of the original Semitic (in Hebrew square characters) אִיּוֹחַ / אִיּוֹחַ * > אִיּוֹחַ / אִיּוֹחַ *. The waw and yodh were frequently confused throughout all the periods of writing in Hebrew square characters [but not in Paleo-Hebrew], and thaw and heth are extremely similar. The Jewish forms thus reconstructed are actually identical with the Avestan ones, even more than the Arabic that derived from Aramaic, as they explain the problematic -y- of Apioχ and Mapioχ.

11 Cf. Vaillant 1952. Iranian elements are abundant in this composition, cf., e.g., Fines 1974; Boyce & Grenet 1991, 427-32.

In ZEnoch the two angels are two trustworthy Watchers (*Erperopi*) whom God established on *Earth* in order to keep watch over it and to control temporal affairs, and to preserve the writing of the hand [of Seth] so that it may not perish in the imminent *flood*. Note that the two Yazatas are in charge of *plants* (established on *Earth*) and *water* (protection from *flood*). It was the truly angelic nature of this pair that urged the Byzantine texts just quoted to identify the Koranic *demons* with the more familiar *angels* of their Iranian and Armenian neighbours. This combined non-Zoroastrian evidence is sufficient, I believe, to suppose that a story similar to the contents of Dk 9.32.1-2 was told in Iran, with *Xurdād ud Mordād as the names of the demons/rebelling angels. This version, Manichaean, "popular" or "heretical", provoked a reaction of the Zandists who included a re-working of their own into the Warštmānsār Nask.

[TEXT I] Bd 1.2-10:

2-4. pad wēh.Dēn ōʾn paydāg kū Ohrmazd bālistig pad harwirp.āgāhīh ud wēhīh ud zamān ī akanārag andar rōšnīh hamē būd. hān rōšnīh gāh ud gyāg ī Ohrmazd.hast kē asar rōšnīh gōwēd. hān harwirp.āgāhīh ud wēhīh ud zamān ī akanārag*hāmag ī Onrmazd hast kē gōwēd Dēn. ham har dō wizarīšn ēwag, hān ī *hāmag ī zamān ī akanārag], ciyōn Ohrmazd gāh ud Dēn - zamān ī Ohrmazd ī būd [ud hast ud hamē bawēd] hēnd. Ahriman andar tārīkīh pad pas.dānišnīh ud zadār.kāmīh zufr.pāyag būd [būd ud hast *kū nē bawēd]. ū.š zadār.kāmagīh hāmag hān tārīkīh gyāg hast kē asar tārīkīh gōwēd.

5-6. ū.šān miyān tuhtīgīh būd, hast kē wāy gōwēd, kē.š gumezišn padēš har dōwān hēnd kanāragōmandīh ud akanāragōmandīh.

7-8. cē bālistīh hān ī asar.rōšnīh gōwēd, kū nē sarōmand, ud zufr.pāyag hān ī asar.tārīkīh [gōwēd], hān hast akanāragōmandīh. pad wimand har dō kanāragōmand, kū.šān miyān tuhtīgīh ud ēwag ō did nē paywast hēnd.

9-10. did har dōwān mēnōg pad xʿēštan kanāragōmand, did harwisr.āgāhīh ī Ohrmazd rāy har ciš andar dahišn ī Ohrmazd kanāragōmand *ud *akanāragōmand, cē ēn hān ī andar har dōwān mēnōg hēnd paymān dānēnd.

2-4. This is how it is manifest in the Good Religion (Good Avesta?), namely: "Ohrmazd was continually on high in (His) omniscience and goodness and the infinite (borderless) time¹ inside the light[ness]. This light[ness] was the time² and place of Ohrmazd. There is one who says: "it is the limitless³ light[ness]". This omniscience and goodness and the infinite (borderless) time are the totality⁴ of Ohrmazd; there is one who calls it "Religion (Avesta)". The interpretation of both is one: the totality of the infinite (borderless) time], as Ohrmazd and (His) space (or, "time"; or, "throne") and (His) Religion (Avesta?) are the time of Ohrmazd, who was [and is, and ever shall be]. Ahriman was based in abyss inside the darkness in (his) backward-knowledge (*anti-knowledge*) and (in his) fondness to smite [he was, and is, but will not be]. The fondness to smite is his totality, this darkness is a place, about which there is one who says: "it is the limitless⁵ darkness".

5-6. Between them was void. Some call it Wāy, in which is the mixture of both infinity and finitude.

7-8. For being high above, that which (one) calls infinite light, means that it has no beginning/limit, and being based in abyss, that which [(one) calls] infinite darkness, this is infinity. At the border both are limited, because between them (was) void, and they do not touch each other.

9-10. Again, these two spirits are limited in themselves; again, because of Ohrmazd's omniscience, everything is inside the creation of Ohrmazd, both limited and limitless, for they knew that which is inside these two spirits, as the measure.

[TEXT I] Y 36:

1. Ahlīā 0ēā ā0ē0 vərəzənā paouruīē pairijasāmaidē mazdā ahurā 0ēā 0ēā
mainīu spanīštā yō ā extiš ahmāi yām extōlōi
dāghē.

2. uruūāzištō huū nō yātāliā paitī.jamīiā ātarā mazdā ahurahiā
uruūāzištahiā uruūāzāiā nāmīštahiā nēmanhā nō mazištāi
yāghām paitī.jamīiā.

3. ātarš vōi mazdā ahurahiā aht. mainīuš vōi ahlīā spāništō aht. hīat vā
tōi nēmanām vāzištām ātarā mazdā ahurahiā tā 0ēā pairijasāmaidē.

4. vohū 0ēā managhā vohū 0ēā ašā vaḡhuiiā 0ēā cištōiš
šīiao0ēanāišcā vacābišcā pairijasāmaidē.

5. nēmaxīiāmāhī išūdiāmāhī 0ēā mazdā ahurā. višpāiš 0ēā humatāiš
višpāiš hūxtāiš višpāiš huvarāštāiš pairijasāmaidē.

6. sraēštām aī tōi kahrpām kahrpām auuāēdaiāmāhī mazdā ahurā imā raocā
barēzištām barēzēmanām auuat yāi huvarē auuāct.

1 Or, "for infinite time".

2 Or, "space"; or, "throne".

3 Thus better than "endless".

4 yāmag, "garment" (Nyberg); xēm[ag], "nature", (Scheftelowitz); ahamkay [?], "ohne Rivalen [?]", (Schaefer); hāmāg, "universum", Bailey apud Zaehner 1955, 286-7; hāmāg, "year", Shaked 1980, 29-30 n. 2 and p. 30. hāmāg, "all"; niyāmag, "sheath" (compare the emendation in S G W 16.52).

5 Thus better than "endless".

1. At first we approach you, O Mazdā Ahura, with the community of this fire¹. (we approach) you with your most holy spirit, you who are pain to the one whom you seize for painful treatment².
2. O fire of Mazdā Ahura, may you, the most delightd one, come to us for (your) share, may you come to us for the greatest of sharings, with the delight of the most delightful one, with the reverence of the most reverent one.
3. You are indeed the fire of Mazdā Ahura. You are indeed His most holy spirit. We approach you, O fire of Mazdā Ahura, (pronouncing) that of your names which is the most welcome among them.
4. We approach you with good thought, with good truth, and with the actions and words of good insight.
5. We worship and invigorate you, O Mazdā Ahura. We approach you with all our well-thought (thoughts), with all our well-spoken (words), with all our well-performed (actions).
6. We attribute to you, O Mazdā Ahura, the most beautiful body among bodies, these lights here³ (as well as) yonder (light), the highest among the high since it was given the name 'sun'⁴.

1 "With the community of this fire", or: "with the shelter of this fire" (Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 55).

2 Schwartz 1985a, 493: "Through the communion (vərəzənā; not hapax "activity") of Your Fire may we come close to you, AM, through Your Holiest Spirit; You who are taboo (=off limits) for him whom You have established as being taboo (yā āxtiš zhmāi yām axtayōi dāghē). May You, most contentedly inclined, come close to us, O Fire".

3 "These lights here", i.e. the sacrificial fire (ib.).

4 "Since it was given the name sun", i.e. since it was created by Ahura Mazda (ib.).

[TEXT M] PY 36:--

1. ēdōn ē ēd ī tō āta(x)š pad warzišn fradom bē rasom Ohrmazd [pad pāhrēz ud šnāyēnīdārīh] [pad ēd ī tō ātān] pad ēd ī tō mēnōg abzōnīg [ciyōn az Dēn paydāg] kē ē awē ēnīgth⁵ [kū pad āta(x)š anāgīh kunēd] hānēz ē awē ēnīgth dahēd [kū hānēz pad awē anāgīh kunēd].
2. pad urwāhmīh⁶ ē awē mard pad tuwān bē rāsēd āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd pad urwāhmīh ē awē kēš urwāhmīh azēš ud pad niyāyīšnōmandīh ē awē niyāyīšnōmand mard pad hān ī meh kār⁷ bē rāsēd [pad passāxt ī pad tan ī pasēn].
3. āta(x)š pad hān ī Ohrmazd āgāh hast [pad Dēn ī Ohrmazd] ud pad mēnōgīh āgāh hast [hānēš hast ī kēš pad Warhrānīh bē nīšīnēnd] abzōnīg hast x^vad⁸ tā ka awē ī tō nām ciyōn wāzišt ē āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd ī tō pad hān ī har dō bē rasom [kūš hixr ī mēnōg ud gētīg azēš pas dārom].
4. hān ī weh menišn ē tō pad hān weh tārsāgīh ē tō pad hān ī weh frazānagīh ē tō padēz kunišn ud gōwišn bē rasom.
5. niyāyīšnēnēh ēw ūm abāmēnēh ēw tō Ohrmazd [kūm ābām pad tō bawād] pad harwisp humat ē tō ud pad harwisp huxt ud pad harwisp huwaršt bē rasom.
6. nēwag ēd ī tō karb ūt az karbān niwēyēnišn⁹ dahom Ohrmazd [kū andar gēhān dh gōwom kū karb ēd ī tō nēwag.tar] ēn [ruwān] ē hān ī rōšnīh ī bālist [az hān ī pad cāsm paydāg] bālēnēnd ānōh kū hān ī x^varšēd guft.

5 ēnīgth, "pollution", translates axtay-, "Schmerz", glossed over anāgīh, waštāgīh, dard, bēmrāī in New Persian.

6 Translates Urvāzišt, cf. also Y 17.11.

7 mah kār, "great ordeal", translates mazišīdī yāgham and maza- yāghō, Y 30.2.

8 A mistake for hīlāt.

9 Similarly in Wispered 11.19, where ā-vistay- ("Zuweisung (eines Opfers, Gebets), Widmung, Weihe", cf. AIW 334) was translated by the same verb: yaī uzdātēm yaī zuuistēm yaōa diš auuāēdāliat ahurō mazdā ašauua yaōa diš auuāēdāliat yō ašauua zaraōuštrō yaōa diš azēm yō zaota auuāēdāliem! ... "just as the 'righteous' ahurō mazdā dedicates that what is assigned, what is sanctified, just as the 'righteous' Zoroaster dedicates it, just as I, the Zaoar, dedicate it" (cf. Wolff 1910, 119). The Pahlavi version is as follows: kē ul dād kē niwēyēnīd ciyōnīh awēšān niwēyīd Ohrmazd ī ahlaw ud ciyōnīh awēšān niwēyīd kē ahlaw Zarduīxīšt ciyōnīh awēšān ēd kē zōd hom, "He who created up, He who (dedicatedly) announced, their nature announced Ohrmazd the righteous, and their nature announced he, who is Zoroaster the righteous, their nature do announce I, who am a zōd priest".

1. Thus I¹⁰ will arrive first to this Fire of Thee, O Ohrmazd!, with action¹¹ [with care and propitiation] [with these Gəθə's of Thy], with this bountiful spirit of Thee [as is manifest from the Avesta/Revelation]; one to whom (there is) pollution [who badly afflicts the Fire], even to him He gives pollution [i.e., He badly afflicts him, too].

2. With Joy to that man¹², with strength arrives the Fire of Ohrmazd, with Joy to that man, from whom (there is) Joy, and through praiseworthiness to this praiseworthy man¹³, with this greater work he arrives [through the constitution which is in the Body to Come¹⁴].

3. The Fire is cognizant of that which belongs to Ohrmazd [with the Avesta/Revelation of Ohrmazd] and (the Fire) is cognizant of (the) spirit [it is this one when they establish it (the Fire) as a Warhrān Fire], it is bountiful by itself, in order I will be capable to arrive, in These Both, to this name of thee, which is Wəzīšt, to the Fire of Ohrmazd [i.e., I will take away from it (the Fire) the spiritual and corporeal dung].

4. I arrive to Thee (*with) good thought, with good reverence, with good intelligence¹⁵, and with action and speaking, too.

5. May Thou be praised and may Thou place me in debt, Thou, O Ohrmazd! [i.e., let me be obliged to Thee]; let me arrive to Thee in every good thought and in every good word, and in every good deed.

6. Good is this body-form of Thee, and I (dedicatedly) announce Thee, O Ohrmazd!, among the body-forms [I proclaim thus in the world(s) that this body-form of Thee is the best]; this [soul] they elevate to this the most high light [(high even) from what is open to the eye] there, which is called Sun.

¹⁰ As in many other cases in translations from Pahlavi, the decision between 1st Sng and 1st Pl is arbitrary. The Avestan text has only Pl; I translated in the Pahlavi version only Sng.

¹¹ A pseudo-etymological rendering. Cf. nn. 1-2.

¹² A mistake instead of "to us".

¹³ Cf. the previous note.

¹⁴ Cf. Dk 9.35.12; the word *pad* before *tan* I *pasēn* seems to be superfluous.

¹⁵ The grammatical case was wrongly analyzed.

[TEXT III] Dk 9.35.11-13:

11. abar dādan ī Ohrmazd āta(x)š ō srāyišn ud ayārth ud pānagth ī mardomān, dāštan ud ayārēnīdan ī mardom ud mēnōg ī āta(x)š ō awē kēš urwāhmth ud ō awē niyāyišn kunēd kēš niyāyišn kard.

12. hān ī meh kār ī hast passāxt ī tan ī pasēn kē padēš dām abēzag bawēd pad āta(x)š bawēd xwānēd ābistan¹⁶ ī mardom az Yazdān ayāft rāy.

13. ud ēnōz kū cē ēdōnat Zardu(x)št šnāyēnīdār, tom kū:man wēš pad rāmīšn tuwān kardan hu.madārthā:tar hēm kū Mānušcihr tuwān madan ka az ahmā xwāhē Zardu(x)št kē Amahraspandān hēm.

¹⁶ Perhaps, should be read *abestām and an echo of Dk 9.30.10 would be seen: abestām ī yazdān dārēnd, "they possess the support of Gods".

11. About Fire being created by Ohrmazd for protection, assistance and refuge of people, (its) maintainance and assistance by people, and the Spirit of Fire produces Joy and praise for him, who performed praises.

12. This greater work that exists, the constitution of the Body to Come, whereby the creatures will become pure, is through Fire; one calls for the boon of human support (?) from God(s).

13. And this, too: "Since you, O Zoroaster!, are the most propitiatory, i.e., you are able to perform most for our ease, so We are more disposed to come than Mānušcihr could come, when you call for Us, O Zoroaster!, We, who are the Bountiful Immortals".

[TEXT IV] Dk 9.57.12-18:

12. ud enəz kū pāhrēz ud tarsāgīh ī āta(x)š kard bawēd ke ō āta(x)š rād ciš be dahēd pāhrēz ud tarsāgīh ī āta(x)š kunēd ud awē padēš ham mīzd bawēd.

13. ud enəz kū ke pad urwāhmīh Dēn ī Ohrmazd cāšēd əš pāhrēz ud tarsāgīh ī āta(x)š, ciyōn az Dēn paydāg, kard bawēd, ēdēz rāy cēš hānēz hammōxt pad kunišn ī az hān hammōzišn ham bawēd.

14. ud enəz kū niyāyišn ī niyāyišn niyābagān wizārd bawēd ke Wahman dōšēd.

15. ud enəz kūš āta(x)š pad hān ī meh kār ī hast passāxt ī pad tan ī pasēn zōrēnīd bawēd ke āta(x)š pad "āta(x)š" nāmīh xʷanēd. ēdēz rāy cēš nām abar ciyōnīh ī stāyišnīg nihād ēstēd, kaš pad hān nām xʷand ēgəš stūd zōrēnīd bawēd.

16. ud enəz kū pad Dēn ī Ohrmazd āgāh bawēd ke Dēn ī Ohrmazd pad rāmišn cāšēd, ēdēz rāy cē har dānišn pad hammōxtārīh warzihēd abzāyīhēd.

17. ud enəz kū ke gōwišn ud kunišn ī frārōn cāšēd əš pad hān ī weh frazānagīh Ohrmazd šnāyēnīd bawēd, enəz rāy cē frazānagīh bahr dō gōwišn ud kunišn.

18¹⁷. enəz kūš karb ī Ohrmazd pad nēwag.tomīh stāyīd bawēd ke xʷēš ruwān ō xvaršēd pāyagīh bālistēnēd, ēdēz rāy cē hān ī karb hast ī Ohrmazd ud pad xʷaršēd pāyagīh bālist ud nēwag.tom bawēd.

17 Cf. Bailey 1943, 119.

12. And this, too, the care and reverence of Fire will be provided by him who is generous to Fire, gives things to Fire¹⁸, provides the care and reverence of Fire, and he (that person) will be rewarded through it in the same manner.
13. And this, too, that the care and reverence of Fire are provided by whom who teaches the Avesta/Religion of Ohrmazd with Joy, as is revealed from the Avesta¹⁹, for this reason, too, that resulting from this teaching the taught (material) becomes one with action.
14. This, too, that the prayer to the suitable ones to prayers is arranged by him who loves Wahman.
15. And this, too, that Fire will be strengthened in this greater work that exists, the constitution of the Body to Come²⁰, by whom who calls Fire by the name "āta(x)š" (Fire)²¹. For this reason, too, that the name is applied to (its) laudable nature, (so) when one calls (Fire) by this name, then the praised one becomes strengthened.
16. And this, too, this one will be informed in the Avesta/Religion of Ohrmazd, who teaches the Avesta/Religion of Ohrmazd in peace²², even for this reason that every knowledge is practised and increased through teaching.
17. And this, too, one who teaches the righteous speaking and acting, through this good intelligence Ohrmazd will be propitiated. For this reason, too, that the intelligence has two parts: that which should be said and that which should be made.
18. This, too, that the bodily form of Ohrmazd is praised as being the best by him who elevates his own soul to the stationship of the sun, even for that reason that the bodily form of Ohrmazd exists and becomes the loftiest and the best in the stationship of the sun.

18 I. e., "makes offerings to the Fire-temples"?

19 The words "as is revealed from the Avesta" seems to be a gloss explaining how the teaching must be performed.

20 Cf. Dk 9.35.12; the word *pad* before *tan* *pasēn* seems to be superfluous.

21 Cf. Y 36.6.

22 Or, "ease"; or, "joy", as *rāmīšn* is the standard gloss to *urwāhmTh*.

[TEXT V] Smaller Sīrōzag 9²³ / Ataš Niyāyišn 5-7²⁴:

9. Ata(x)š ī Ohrmazd pus²⁵ [Adur Farrbay], xVarrah ud sūd ī Ohrmazd.dād, Erān xVarrah ī Ohrmazd.dād ud Kayān xVarrah ī Ohrmazd.dād [kūš kārth āsrōnTh ēd kū pad hān ī kustag āsrōnān dānāgtar ud kirdārtar bawēnd pad rāh ī awē. hān kē abāg Dahāg paykār kard awē bawēd²⁶], āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd pus [Adur ī Gušnasp], Kay Xusraw, war ī Xusraw [pad Ađurbādagān], Asnawand Gar ī Ohrmazd.dād ud Cēcast War ī Ohrmazd.dād [ēw az Cēcast ō hān war 4 frasang], Kayān xVarrah ī Ohrmazd.dād [ūš kār ī artēštārTh ēd kū pad kustag ī Ađurbādagān artēštār tēztar ud tagīgtar hēnd pad rāh awē bawēd²⁷] [Adur ī Burzēn] āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd pus, Rēwand Gar ī Ohrmazd.dād ud Kayān xVarrah ī Ohrmazd.dād [ūš kār ī wāstaryōšTh ud wāstaryōšTh ēd kū wāstaryōš pad Abaršahr tu(x)šāgtar, warzišnīgtar ud šust.jāmagtar hēnd pad rāh awē. hān kē abāg Wištāsp paykār, awē bawēd. paydāg kū pad ēn har 3 pēšag andar har 3 har 3 hast cē āsrōnān āsrōnTh āšnāg²⁸, ūšān artēštārTh druz ī mēnōg²⁹ zadan, ūšān wāstaryōšTh yazīšn saxtan³⁰.

23 Pahlavi: Dhabhar 1927, 165-7; English: Dhabhar 1963, 307-334; Dehdašt 1363h.š. (1985), 45-51 (SmSīrōzag 9); Dehdašt 1363h.š. (1985), 51-54 (GrSīrōzag 9); the version of GrSīrōzag is much shortened in comparison to that of SmSīrōzag and does not add much to our knowledge.

24 Pahlavi: Dhabhar 1927, 36-49; English: Dhabhar 1963, 67-70) is basically identical with the text of SmSīrōzag 9. The variant readings are given in the notes to the text of SmSīrōzag 9.

25 Yt 19.45-49 mentions "Fire, the son of Ahura Mazda".

26 Ataš Niyāyišn 5 adds here another gloss: *nām ī ēn āta(x)š Farrbay. ēn āta(x)š pēšag āsrōnTh dārd kū dastwarān ud mōbedān dānāgtar ud wuzurgTh ud xVarrah ī pad ayārTh ī ēn āta(x)š *windēnd ud hān ī abāg Dahāg paykār kard pad rāh ī awē*, "The name of this Fire is Farrbay. This Fire has the profession of priests in order that the dastwars and the mobeds could obtain wisdom, greatness and xVarrah (glory) through the assistance of this Fire, and it is through it (the Fire) that he (the Fire?) fought Dahāg".

27 Ataš Niyāyišn 5 adds here another gloss: *ud nām ī ēn āta(x)š Adur ī Gušnasp hast ud kār ēw ī ēn āta(x)š artēštārTh kū pad andaron ī Ađurbādagān artēštār tēztar ud tagīgtar hast pad rāh ī awē. ud šāh Kay Xusraw abar Wahman ōz pērdzgarTh ayāft pad ayārTh ī ēn āta(x)š ud pad pēš Ohrmazd nālid ud faryād kard ō ēn Adur ī Gušnasp būd*, "And the name of this Fire is the Fire Gušnasp, and the function of this Fire is the warriorship. It is through it that the warriors are swifter and mightier inside: Ađurbādagān. And the king Kay Xusraw gained a victory over Wahman Diz with the assistance of this Fire and it was this Fire Gušnasp which lamented and cried for help to Ohrmazd".

28 Ataš Niyāyišn 6 adds: *yašt kardan*, "to perform yašt (worship)".

29 Ataš Niyāyišn 6 reads: *druz ī Gannāg Mēnōg*.

30 Ataš Niyāyišn 6 has a different reading: *pīh saxtan*, "to prepare food".

[To] the Fire, son of Ohrmazd [the Fire Farrbay], [to] the xVarrah and profit created by Ohrmazd, [to] the Iranian xVarrah created by Ohrmazd, [to] the Kayanian xVarrah created by Ohrmazd [whose job is the priesthood, and it is through it that the priests become wiser and more effective in this quarter³¹; t was he (the Fire Farrbay) who fought Dahāg]. [To] the Fire, son of Ohrmazd [the Fire Gušnasp], [to] Kay Xusraw, [to] the Lake (of) Xusraw [in Aōurbādagān], [to] the Mount Asnawand created by Ohrmazd, and [to] the Lake Cēcast created by Ohrmazd [know that it is 4 *frasangs* from Cēcast to that lake (Lk. Xusraw?)], [to] the Kayanian xVarrah created by Ohrmazd [whose job is warriorship, and it is through it that the warrior become swifter and mightier in the quarter of Aōurbādagān], [to] the Fire Burzēn, the Fire, son of Ohrmazd, [to] Mount Rēwand created by Ohrmazd, and [to] the Kayanian xVarrah created by Ohrmazd [whose job is husbandry, and husbandry is this that it is through it that the husbandmen in Abaršahr (Parthia) are more energetic, productive and their clothes are cleaner. And it is he (the Fire Burzēn.Mihr) who fought (together) with Wištāsp. It was revealed (in the Avesta about) these three profession-"casts" all three (are counted), as the priests are known by (their) priesthood, (but) their warriorship is to smite the *mēnōg* *druz*-demon(s), (while) their husbandry is to perform the (Yasna?) ritual.

31 The glossator's country, apparently, Pārs.

artēštārān ašan artēštārīh āšnāg, ūšān āsrōnīh yašt kardan ūšān wāstrayōšīh zēn abzār sāxtan. wāstaryōšān wāstaryōšīh āšnāg ūšān āsrōnīh yašt kardan ūšān artēštārīh gurg ud duz[d]³² abāz dāštan³³. Ata[x]š ī Ohrmazd pus, āta[x]š ī abzōnīg artēštār yazad ī purr. xVarrah, yazad ī purr.*bēšāzēnīdārīh [aš artēštārīh druz zadārīh purr.xVarrahīh, aš xVarrahōmandīh ud. bēšāzēnīdārīh mēnōgīhā zadārīh *āho[g]ān.* gardān³⁴ az Spennā[g].Mēnōg dāmān, hast ī āta[x]š ī Dārāy]. Ata[x]š ī Ohrmazd pus, abāg harwispēn āta[x]šān, xVadayīh kē nāfōmand Neryō[k]sang yazad [ūš xVadāy nāfīh ad kū nāf ī xVadāyān ud dehbēdān dūdag *ī āzādāgān ud wuzurgān, abāz ārāyīšīh ī rāyōmand ud xVarrahōmand tōhmag *az awē].

32 Ataš Niyāyīšn 6 has instead of gurg ud duz a different reading: dewīg ud druz.

33 Ataš Niyāyīšn 6 adds here another gloss: nām ī ēn āta[x]š Adur Burzēn.Mihr hast ūš kār ēw wāstaryōšīh hast kū wāstaryōšān o abar kār ēw ī wāstaryōšīh dānāgtar ud tu[x]šāgtar ud šust.jāmagtar hēnd pad ayārīh ī ēn āta[x]š ud abāg Wištāsp pūrsagīh ud passax kard awē ēn āta[x]š būd. "The name of this Fire is Adur Burzēn, and the function of this Fire is the husbandry, in order that the husbandmen could be more energetic, productive and their clothes cleaner through the assistance of this Fire, and it was this Fire that spoke with Wištāsp".

34 Dhabhar 1963, 320 (cf. also nn. 12-13): "averting [gartān] infection (*āhūkīnīš) [from the creatures of Spēnāk Mīnō]. Dehdaštī 1363h.s. (1985), 50-1 (cf. also nn. 4-5): axvišn dārtān, "az bin burdan-ī dārdhā-ī maddī [az dāmān-ī Sepīnā Mīnū] (to carry away the material pain [from the creatures of the Bountiful Spirit])". The first problematic word in the version of Ataš Niyāyīšn 6 is written slightly differently; Dhabhar 1963, 69 (cf. also nn. 10-11) translated "averting pollution". He noted the (Zoroastrian) New Persian version: bīmarg gardān, and Dhalla's reading and translation, apparently based on it: ahōšn, "rendering unconscious". In my opinion, the first corrupt word goes back to PY 36.1, ēnīgīh, "pollution", which translates axtay-, "Schmerz", glossed over ānīgīh, wāštīgīh, dard; bēmārī in New Persian (compare the also corrupt (Zoroastrian) New Persian version: bīmarg).

The warriors are known by (their) warriorship, (but) their priestdom is to perform the yašt-worship, (while) their husbandry is to produce arms and equipment. The husbandmen are known by (their) husbandry, (but) their priestdom is to perform the yašt-worship, (while) their warriorship is to keep back wolves and thieves].

[To] the Fire, son of Ohrmazd, the bountiful fire, the warrior, yazata full of xVarrah, yazata full of healing [his being a warrior is his smiting the *druj*-demon(s), his being full of xVarrah is his xVarrah-ness, his healing is (his) smiting (of demons) *mēnōgically* and ...? ...? from the creature of the Bountiful Spirit. This is the Fire of Dārāy (Darius)³⁵].

[To] the Fire, son of Ohrmazd, together with all the fires; [to] Neryō[k]sang yazad, who is of lordly origin³⁶ [whose lordly origin is this that it is the race of lords and governors of provinces, the family of noblemen and grandees, and (it is) from him (that) the re-arrangement of the majestic and glorious lineage³⁷ (takes place)].

35 Dhabhar 1963, 321 and n. 14: "of hearth". Dehdašt 1363h.š. (1985), 50-1: dārāi, "dary".

36 Note the Parthian word-order.

37 Bailey 1943, 44: "the family of the lords and rulers, the family of the well-born and great, the establishment of the rich and prosperous family"; Dhabhar 1963, 321: "...and it is through him (that there is) the further embellishment of the bright and glorious lineage of the family, the noblemen and the grandees".

[TEXT VI] Bd 18

Abar ciyōnīh ī āta(x)š

1. Gōwēd pad Den kū: "panj ēwēnag āta(x)š brēhēntīd ēstēd [Āta(x)š ī Bərəzī Sawang, Āta(x)š ī Wohu-Frīān, Āta(x)š ī Urwāzīšt, Āta(x)š ī Wazīšt, Āta(x)š ī Spēnīšt]".
2. Āta(x)š ī Bərəzī Sawang āta(x)š ī pēš ī Ohrmazd ī xVadāy waxšēd³⁸.
3. Āta(x)š ī Wohu-Frīān [ī wīzārīd weh.franāftār] hān ī andar tan ī mardomān ud gōspandān³⁹.
4. Āta(x)š ī Urwāzīšt hān ī andar urwarān⁴⁰.

About the nature of the Fire[s].

1. He says in the Avesta, namely: "five kinds of fires were created [the fire Bərəzī Sawang, the fire Wohu-Frīān, the fire Urwāzīšt, the fire Wazīšt, the fire Spēnīšt]".
2. The fire Bərəzī Sawang is the fire blazing before the Lord Ohrmazd.
3. The fire Wohu-Frīān [whose (names') interpretation is *the good propagator/confessor*] is that which is in the bodies of men and cattle/animals.
4. The fire Urwāzīšt is that which is in the plants.

38 This is a shortened reference to PY 17.11; hān ī andar Garōdmān pēš ī Ohrmazd ēstēd, "this is which stands/is before Ohrmazd in Garōdmān". It is apparently PY 17.11 that the Persian Rivāyat (cf. Dhabhar 1932, 59) quoted. PRDD 18d1-2 (cf. Williams 1990, I, 96-7; II, 36, whose translation is adopted here, with slight changes) is longer and quotes lost texts: gyāg ēw paydāg kū āta(x)š ēdōn arzōmān Ohrmazd hān ī āta(x)š tan ud gyān az wārom ud *mēnīšn ī xVēš bē brēhēntīd ūš brāh ud xVarrah az rōšnīh ī asar.rōšnīh bē brēhēntīd ūš panj bē kard. ēwag hān ī andar Garōdmān pēš xVad sōzēd ūš gōbr ī mardomān padaš weh kunēd ud ēwag hān īš andar tan ī mardomān bē dād ēwag hān kēš dēw ī *Spinjāy padāš zanēd ud ēwag hān īš andar āb ud urwar bē dād ēwag hān īš bē ō gētīg kamīst dād, "(in) one place (it is) revealed that the fire (is) so valuable, Ohrmazd created the body and soul of the Fire from His own mind and thought, and He created (its radiance and glory from the light of the Endless Light. One (is) that which burns before Himself in Garōdmān, and with this he makes true the essence of men; and one (is) that which He created in the body of men; one (is) that by which He smites the demon *Spinjāy; and one (is) that which He created in water and plants; one (is) that which He desired to create in the material world". The version of Zādspram was based on older texts, most probably identical with the source of Bd 18, but not from Bd 18 itself (cf. further). WZs 3.78: ūš āta(x)š ī *abzōnīg xVad andar Garōdmān bē dād ūš paydāgīh pad āta(x)š ī pad zamīg sōzīšnīg, "and He created that bountiful fire in the Garōdmān, and it (the fire) is manifest in the fire burning on earth".

39 WZs 3.79: [Weh.franāftār] hān ī andar mardomān ud gōspandān.

40 WZs 3.80: Urwāzīšt hān ī andar urwarān..., etc.

5. Ata[x]š ī Wazīšt hān ī andar abr⁴¹ ī padīrag ī Spinjāy⁴² pad kō[x]šīšn estēd.

6. Ata[x]š ī Spenīšt [ī wīzārd abzōnīg] hān ī andar gēhān pad kār dāšt estēd ud āta[x]šēz ī Wahrām⁴³.

7. Az awēšān panj āta[x]š ēwag āb ud xVārīšn hac dō xVārēd ciyōn hān ī andar tan ī mardomān⁴⁴ [tā pad kōmīg⁴⁵ dād estēd ūš xVārīšn ud āb gugārdan xVēškārīh⁴⁶] ēwag āb xVārēd ud xVārīšn nē xVārēd, ciyōn hān ī andar urwarān⁴⁷ kēš pad āb zīwēd ud waxšēd, ēwag xVārīšn xVārēd ud āb nē xVārēd, ciyōn hān ī andar gētīh pad kār dāreūd ud āta[x]šēz ī Wahrām⁴⁸, ēwag nē āb xVārēd ud nē xVārīšn, ciyōn āta[x]š ī Wazīšt ud hān ī Barāzī Sawang, ud hān ī andar zamīg ud kōf ud abārtīg cīs.

5. The fire Wazīšt is that which is in the cloud[s], which confronts (the dēw) Spinjāy in the battle.

6. The fire Spenīšt [whose (names') interpretation is *the bountiful*] is that which is in use in the world(s), and (it is) also the Fire Wahrām/Wahrān.

7. Among these five Fires one consumes both liquid and substance, as that (fire) which is in the human bodies [that it would be created in the belly, whose (the fire's) function is to digest substance and liquid], one consumes liquid, but not substance, as that (fire) which is in the plants, which lives and grows by means of liquid, one consumes substance, but not liquid, as that (fire) which is used in the gētīg-material world, and also (as) the Fire Wahrām/Wahrān; one consumes not liquid nor substance, as the Fire Wazīšt and the (Fire) Barāzī Sawang, and that (fire) which is inside the earth, mountains and other things.

41 WZs 3.81.: Wazīšt hān kēš andar abr rawīšn dāred, Wāzīšt is that which moves in the clouds.

42 Spitilura, Dahak's brother (Yt 19.46), was confused (cf. Aiw 1619, 1625) with Wīštāsp's opponent Spinja.uruška (Yt 9.31) dažuualiasna, "demon-dworshipper", and with the demon Spēnjāyriia (Vd 19.40). The name's form adopted here is Spinjāy. The episode referred here to is as follows (GrBd 6b.14; cf. also Vd 19.40; WZs 3.81; PRDD 18d2): andar hān wārān kirdārīh Spinjāy ud Apōš kō[x]šīd hēnd ud āta[x]š ī Wazīšt gad abar wašt ud āb tāzēnīd andar abran, Spinjāy az hān gad zanīšnīh yarrānīd ud wāng kard ciyōn nūnēz pad hān ardīg pad wārān kirdārīh yarrānāng ud [wī]rōzag paydag, "During that producing of rain (by Tīštr-Sirius) Spinjāy and Apōš fought him; and the Fire Wazīšt (the fire of lightning) turned his mace (=bolt) on (them) and he made the water to flow inside the clouds; Spinjāy roared and shouted, because of this mace-blow, as even now roar and lightning are manifest during that producing of rain (by Tīštr-Sirius) in war".

43 Or, Wahrān; all great Sasanian Fires belonged to this type.

44 wōhu-Frīdān, § 3.

45 ZorPht kwmyk, "belly", cf. Bailey 1970, 62.

46 WZs 3.79.: [Weh.franāftar] hān ī andar mardomān ud gōspandān ūš xVārīšn gugārdan ... andar xVēškārīh, "[the good propagator/confessor] is that which is in the humans and animals/cattle, whose duty is to digest the food...".

47 Urwāzīšt, § 4.

48 Spenīšt, § 6.

8.⁴⁹ En se āta[x]š hast Adur ī Farrbay⁵⁰ ud Gušnasp ud Burzēn Mihr. az bun.dahišn Ohrmazd ciyōn se xVarrāh ī awēšān pad pāsbanīh ud panāhīh ī gēhān frāz brēhēnīd. pad hān karb xVarrāhōmandīh andar gēhān hamē waxšīd hēnd⁵¹.

8.⁵² These three Fires are the Fires Farrbay⁵³, Gušnasp⁵⁴, Burzēn.Mihr⁵⁵. Ohrmazd created them from the original creation, like their three xVarrāhs (glories), for guarding and protecting the world(s). They ever blaze in this form⁵⁶, gloriously, in the world(s)⁵⁷.

49 Some of the following §§ are paraphrased in PRDD 46.31ff; this late version is of little interest. On the contrary, the parallel text of WZs 3.82ff. is important (cf. Appendix).

50 Or, Frenbag, Farrōbāg, etc.

51 Cf. WZs 3.84.: ūš pad bun dām hamāg zamīg pad pāsbanīh bē ō *warzāwand ādur ī Farrbay ud *tagīg ādur ī Gušnasp ud purr.sūd ādur ī Burzēn.Mihr ciyōn āsrōn ud artēštār ud wāstaryōš hēnd, abespārd.

52 §§ 8-14 were edited, translated and annotated in Gropp 1975.

53 In the Sasanian epoch, the first major Fire, that of priests and nobles; named presumably after the Fire's founder ("having a lot through Glory/Fortune"). It was kept in Persis, at Kārīdān, then at Fasā, Turkābād, Sarīfābād; cf. Boyce 1985c. On social aspects of the three Fires, cf. KNP 1.13.

54 In the Sasanian epoch, the second major Fire, that of warriors. Originally, the Median Fire, placed at what is known now as Taxt-e Sulaymān; according to one tradition (New Persian Zand ī Wahman

Yāšt), it was removed to PadašxVārgar (for translation, cf. Dhabhar 1932, 467, 469). Actually, it was probably extinguished in 10th-11th century, cf. Boyce 1985b.

55 In the Sasanian epoch, the third major Fire, that of peasants, in Rēwand near NTšāpūr. Originally, the highest Parthian Fire, named presumably after the Fire's founder ("Mihr is lofty"); cf. Boyce 1975f, Russell 1985, Boyce 1985a.

56 So TD1. Or, "body", according to the variant reading (tn) of TD2. Compare Bd 18.15.

57 WZs 3.84.: And on the basic creation, (Ohrmazd) entrusted the whole earth into the guardianship to the powerful Fire Farrbay, to the valiant Fire Gušnasp, to the wholly-profitable Fire Burzēn.Mihr, as they are the priest, the warrior and the husbandman.

9. ud andar xVadāyih ī Taxmuruf⁵⁸ ka mardom pad pušt ī Gāw ī Sarsōk az xVānīrah ō abārtig kišwar hamē widārd hēnd⁵⁹, šab ēw miyān ī zrēh pad wād ī start⁶⁰, ādurgah⁶¹ kēš āta(x)š andar būd [ciyōn pad pušt ī Gāw pad 3 gyāg kard ēstad⁶²] [abāg āta(x)š bē ō zrēh] ōbast. awēšān har se āta(x)š ciyōn se xVarrah, pad gyāg.gāh⁶³ ī ādurgah⁶⁴ pad pušt ī Gāw. Hamē waxšīd hēnd tā rōšn bē būd ud hān mardomān pad zrēh abāz widārd hēnd⁶⁵.

9. And during the rule/epoch of Taxmuruf, when people were passing on the back of the Sarsōk Bull from xVānīrah to other continents, one night, by strong wind in the middle of the sea, a fire-altar, in which there was fire, fell [as it was made in three places on the Bull's back] [into the sea with the fire]. These three Fires, like three xVarrahs (glories), were blazing instead of the fire-altar, on the Bull's back, to that extent that there was light and these people passed over the sea.

58 WZs 3.86: pad xVadāyih ī Hōšang.

59 WZs 3.86: šūd hēnd.

60 WZs 3.86: pad wād ī škeft.

61 WZs 3.86: ādurpāyag.

62 WZs 3.86: abar pušt ī gāw pad se gyāg *dēsīdag.

63 WZs 3.86: gōhrīg.

64 WZs 3.86: ādurpāyag.

65 Partly transcribed and translated in Bailey 1943, 45; my understanding differs on three crucial points: 1), it was the fire set on the Bull's back that fell into the sea, not the three Fires (cf. Boyce 1985a, 472a); 2), I take gyāg.gāh in the sense parallel to one used in WZs, not as Bailey's gyāg.gāh ī ādur.gāh, "fire places"; 3), I read tā rōšn bē būd, not ud hām.rōšn bē būd, "and became wholly bright", as Bailey did.

10. Ud Yim andar xVadāyih hamē kār pad ayārth ī awēšān har se āta(x)š abērtar hamē kard ūš ādur ī Farrbay ō dādgāh pad xVarrahōmand kōf ī pad xVārazm⁶⁶ nišāst ēstad kašān Yim bē kirrēntō, xVarrah ī Yim az dast ī Dahāg ādur ī Farrbay būzēntō⁶⁷.

11. Andar xVadāyih ī Wištāsp šāh pad paydāgih az Dēn az xVārazm ō Rōš[a]n kōf (ī?) pad *Kābulestān⁶⁸ deh nišāst hēnd ciyōn nūnēz ānōh mānēd.

10⁶⁹. And Yim(a), during (his) rule/epoch, was doing all his work(s) always with the help of these three Fires, and he established the Fire Farrbay to its fire-temple on Mt. xVarrahōmand⁷⁰ (Glorious) in xVārazm⁷¹; when Yim(a) was sawed by them, the Fire Farrbay saved the xVarrah⁷² (glory) of Yim(a) from the hand(s) of Dahāg.

11. During the rule/epoch of Wištāsp the king, according to the revelation from Avesta, they established it, (removing) from xVārazm to Mt. Rōš[a]n⁷³, (which is?) in the land of *Kābulestān, where it remains even now.

66 WZs 3.85: Adur ī Farrbay pad xVarrahōmand kōf abar xVārazm gāh grift.

67 Cf. the gloss to SmallSīrōz 9: hān kē abāg Dahāg paykār kard awē bawēd, "it was he (the Fire Farrbay) who fought Dahāg".

68 The name is heavily corrupt. Gropp 1975, 323, read k'lnyk'n [TD1; kwhlnyk'n TD2; k'wist'n k'wly K 20, M], identifying the place with Kāriyān (in Persis, between Siraf on the Gulf-shore and Darabjird), quoting as his source a seal where one finds: zywyd 't'wl pln k'ld'y'n, "Es lebe Adur Farrbag in Kāriyān" oder "Er lebt durch Adur Farrbag in Kāriyān" (Gropp, G., "Some Sasanian Clay Bullae and Seal Stones", *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 19, 1974, p. 140; non vidit, quoted in Gropp 1975, 326 n. 37). Bailey (cf. Bailey, H.W., *The Orbit of Afghan Studies, A Lecture Given at the Society's [the Society for Afghan Studies] Inaugural Meeting*, p. 3 [offprint; no date]) read here (GrBd 125, 1-3), kanārangakān dēh, comparing to Sactrian KAPAAITA, for which the 4th century Byzantine Greek form is καπαριτης, glossed "στρατις", found in Procopius (1,5,4), being from Iranian kāra-, "army"; the Arabic-writing historians knew *knrk*, *knry*, *knrr* as well (on the title, cf. Henning 1965a, 77-9; on the Sactrian word, cf. now Sims-Williams & Cribb 1995/96, 78-81, 92). Cf. also Christensen 1944, 165-6; now also Cereti 1995, 461 n. 49 (who read *Kābulestān), with bibliography.

69 SS 1-14 (TD2 p. 124 l.12) were transcribed and translated in Cereti 1995, 461-2; my understanding is slightly different in § 14.

70 The name of the mountain is formed from the same root as the name of the Fire *Frenbag*/*Farrōbāg*/*Farrbay*. Bd 26.45 even identifies the Avestan atara xVāraṇah, Adur ī xVarrah, with Adur ī Farrbay.

71 WZs 4.85: The Fire Farrbay took (its) place on Mt. xVārahōmand in xVārazm.

72 Cf. the previous note; it is only natural that the Fire Farrbay was associated later with the royal glory and was believed to preserve and to guard it. This link was made also in Smaller Sīrōz 9 and Atāš Niyāyišn 5-7; Yc 19.47, however, speaks simply of "the fire of Ahura Mazda".

73 According to Abayev 1976, 8, it is the region of Pamir populated by Roshans, a Shugrani people connected with the Saka.

12. Adur ī Gušnasp tā xʷadāyīh ī Kay Xusraw pad hān ēwēnag pañāhīh ī gēhān hamē kard, ka Kay Xusraw uždēšzār ī war ī Cēcast⁷⁴ hamē kand⁷⁵ abar ō bušn ī asp nišast ud tār ud tom bē zad ud rōšn bē kard tā uždēšzār kand, pad ham ānōh pad Asnawand kōr⁷⁶ frāz āta[x]š.gahīhā nišast [pad hān cim Gušnasp xʷānēnd cē abar bušn ī asp nišast].

13. Adur ī Burzēn.Mihr tā xʷadāyīh ī Wištāsp šāh *pad hān ēwēnag andar gēhān hamē wazīd, pañāhīh hamē kard.

12. The Fire Gušnasp was protecting, in this manner, the world(s) until the rule/epoch of Kay Xusraw, when Kay Xusraw was razing idol-temples of Lk. Cēcast, (the Fire) sat on a horse' mane and smote the darkness and gloom, and shedded light, until he (Kay Xusraw) razed the idol-temples, he (Kay Xusraw) established it (the Fire) exactly in that same place (of the horse' mane) on Mt. Asnawand [they call it Gušnasp for that reason, because he established it on the 'horse' mane]⁷⁷.

13. The Fire Burzēn.Mihr was flying⁷⁸ in the world(s), protecting, in the same manner, until the rule/epoch of Wištāsp the king.

74 Lk. Urmiā, cf. Bd 12.3; cf. also ZWY 6.10.: hād būd kē Adur ī Gušnasp pad war ī Cēcast ī zafr, garmōg.āb ī jud.dēwīh guft. hād ānōhaz Dēn paydāg, "Know that there is some one who said that it was Adur Gušnasp at the deep lake Cēcast of warm water which is opposed to the dēws; know that even there the Religion became manifest".

75 Cf. DkM 598-9, DkD 357.14-6: ud pas was gēhān marnjēnīdar ī wadtar ud ayōxt ō hān uždēšzār ī abar bār ī war ī Cēcast zad, škast any skeft drōzīh, "then he (Kay Xusraw) smote many worse destroyers of the world(s) and *chamots which were *near that idol-temple on the bank of Lk. Cēcast, and he broke up other monstrous demon".

76 WZs 3.85.: ādur ī Gušnasp pad: Asnawand kōr ī abar Adurbādāgān. For the localization in Adurbādāgān, cf. also Bd 9.29.

77 There is g/w/b oscillation in many Iranian languages and dialects: buš[n] "mane", was equated with the first element of Gušnasp, understood, it its turn, as "horse' (asp) mane (guš[n]-buš[n]), though gušn means "male", thus Gušnasp="stallion". Compare the Armenian name of the Fire Gušnasp: Všnasp. It is tempting to see in this passage, which mentions "Idol-temples" and "horse' mane", a reflection of another meaning of the word būc in SahrErānš 7 we read that pas gizistag Frāsyāb ī Tūr har ēwag nišēmag dēwān uždēšzār ud bašn padaš kard, "then the accursed Frāsyāb ī Tūr made therein every abode into idol-temples of demons and places of (demons') worship". Another readings: Markwart & Messina 1931, 10 (har ēwag nišēmag ī *baʿān dēwān uždēšzār padaš kard); Utas 1976, 116 n. 9 (*šaman for *bagān); Tafazzoli 1990, 48. It was Tafazzoli who made the important suggestion to see here bašn<baʿān>bagina. This word for "place of worship" occurs in Sogdian, Armenian, Georgian.

78 Or, "moving about freely"; cf. also KNAP 14.12: Adur ī Farrbay...ēdōn ciyōn xōs ī suxr andar parrīd, "the Fire Farrbay flew in in the shape of an *eagle". Cf. my remarks on the (popular) etymology of the name of the fire Wazīst, PY 17.11. Gropp 1975, 325, interpreted this passage differently: "sorgte ... speziell (für den Schutz)".

14. Ka anōšag.ruwān Zardu[x]št Dēn āwurd pad rawāgēnīdan ī Dēn

*ud abē.gumān kardan tā Wištāsp šāh ud frazandān pad Dēn ī Yazdān ēstānd [was ciš wēnābdāgīhā nīmūd kard] Wištāsp pad kōf ī Rēwand⁷⁹ kū Pušt ī Wištāspān⁸⁰ gōwēd ō dādāgān nišast.

15. Awēšān har se ādurān ud āta[x]š ī Wahrām/Wahrān hamē tan im āta[x]š ī gētīg, ūšān hān xʷarrah padaš mehmān, hangōšīdag ī tan ī mardomān, ka andar aškomb ī mādar frā bawēd, ruwān ēw az mēnōg abar ništīnēd, kē hān tan tā zī[wa]ndag rayēnēd, ka hān tan frōd mīrēd, tan ō zamīg gumēzēd ud ruwān abāz ō mēnōg šawēd.

14. When Zoroaster of the immortal soul brought forth the revelation, in order to propagate the Religion/Avesta *and to make the men without doubt, so that Wištāsp the king and (his) children might endure in the Religion of God(s), it (Burzēn.Mihr) demonstrated many things visibly, (then) Wištāsp established its (the Fire) fire-temple⁸¹ on Mt. Rēwand, which one calls Pušt ī Wištāspān (Wištāsp's Range/Chain⁸²).

15. The body of all these three Fires and the Fire Wahrām is the gētīg-"material" fire, their xʷarrah (glory) being inhabitant in it, like the human body, when it is conceived in the mother's womb, a ruwān-"soul" from the mēnōg-"spirit" sits over it, which guides this particular body while living; when that body dies, the body mingles with the earth and the soul goes back to the mēnōg-"spirit".

79 Cf. Bd 9.21, 37.

80 WZs 3.85.: ādur ī Burzēn.Mihr pad Rēwand gar ī abar Pušt [ī Wištāspān]. Cf. also Bd 9.37.

81 Dādāgān and dar-e Mihr are synonyms. Note that here the term (dādāgān) is applied to the Burzēn.Mihr/Fire.

82 It is mentioned in Daqiqi's verses, cf. also GrBd 18.10, 12, 14; Amia 1909, 51, cf. ib., 81f, Junker 1912a, 5. Bd, Anklesaria 1908, 80.13: Kōh ī Winābed pad hamāg pušt ī Wištāspān hast, pad Raywand, ud hān gyāg kū āta[x]š ī BurzēnMihr hast, pad noh frasang abāxtar, Tafazzoli 1354[h.š] (1975), 26-7. Bd, Anklesaria 1908, 125.9ff., āta[x]š ī BurzēnMihr] rāy Wištāsp pad Kōh ī Raywand ī gyāg ī kū pušt ī Wištāspān xʷānēnd pad dādāgān nišast, Tafazzoli 1354[h.š] (1975), 27. WZs 3.85., ...ādur ī Burzēn.Mihr pad Rēwand.gar ī abar pušt <ī Wištāspān>, cf. Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 54-5.

16. Hastēz ka hazār āta[x]š ī gētīgthā ō hān ēwag kunēnd, ud pad hān nērang ī paydāg zōhr dahend ud ō dādgāh nišānēnd ēgaš mēnōg ēw ī az xVarrah ī āta[x]šān abar nišīnēd, ciyōn awešānē ka pad āta[x]š ī gētīgthā mehmān būd hēnd; abārtgaz āta[x]š ī Wahrām/Wahrān ūšān tan āta[x]š ī gētīgthā, ruwān hān xVarrah ī az abargarān āyēd, padāš nišāstan, nūnaz ham.ēwēnag druz.zadārth ud panāhth ī mardomān hamē kunēnd; ka afsārēnd, hān xVarrah abāz ō mēnōgān rasēd.

17. Ata[x]š ī Wahrām/Wahrān ēd rāy xVānēnd cē hamē āta[x]š ī pad.gētīh drubuštīh az Wahrām/Wahrān ud panāhth az Srōš ūšān āgenēn hamkārth pad hān hamkārth abāg Wahrām/Wahrān ud ādur ī Farrbay kē hast ādurthā āsrōn ud ādur ī Gušnasp artēštār ud ādur ī Burzēn.Mihr wāstaryōš gōwēd, tā Frašgrid panāhth kirdār ī gehān hēnd, ciyōn wēnābdāg wēnīhēd ka wāzēnd ud dēw ud druz zanēnd ka mardomān gōwēnd kū: "āta[x]š ēw bē widard".

16. There is also, when they unite with a thousand gētīg-"material" fires and perform the zōhr-ceremony by this manifest nērang and establish it to the fire-temple, then a mēnōg-"spirit" from the xVarrah (glory) of the fires sits over it, like even these, when they were inhabitant in the gētīg-"material" fire, and even other Wahrām Fires: their body is the gētīg-"material" fire, (their) ruwān-"soul" is that xVarrah (glory) which comes from divinities, to be established on it; even now they (still) are performing, in the same manner, destruction of the druz(s) and protection of the human beings; when they extinguish it, this xVarrah (glory) arrives back to the to the mēnōg-"spirits".

17. The Fire Wahrām is called so for the reason that all the fires in the gētīg(-material existence) are supported by (the Yazata) Wahrām and protected by Srōš, one says that their co-operation together (is like) the co-operation between Wahrām and the Fire Farrbay which is, in the aspect of fires, (their = fires') priest, and the Fire Gušnasp - (their) warrior, and and the Fire Burzēn.Mihr - (their) husbandman⁸³; they are protectors of the world until the Renovation, as it is seen visibly when they (the fires) fly (while blazing) and smite the dēw(s) and the druz(s), when people say: "a fire has passed".

83 Cf. WZs 3.84.

18. Ata[x]š ī Wahrām was hast, har ēwag dehbed ēw nišāst ēstēd *gōkān was.

19. Ciyōn ādurēz Wartastar ī pad Baxlān andar Pēšag deh Frēdōn nišāst ēstēd.

20. Adur ī Kādagān kē Uzaw ī Taxmurufān andar deh nišāst pad hān pādāšn kūš xVānīhēd⁸⁴.

21. Adur ī Karkōy⁸⁵ ciyōn ēw āta[x]š pad Sagestān Frāsiyāb nišāst kaš pādixšāyīh ī Erān.šahr kard.⁸⁶

18. There are many fires (of the type) Wahrām, each one established by a ruler of the land, and (their) detailed exposition is lengthy.

19. Such as the Fire Wartastar in Bactria, in the land Pēšag, established by Frēdōn.

20. The Fire Kādagān established in the land by Uzaw son of Taxmuruf for the reward that he would be invoked.

21. The Fire Karkōy was established as the one (only) fire in Sagestān by Frāsiyāb, while he was wielding sovereignty in the Iranian Empire.

84 Bailey 1933/5c, 761: pad hān pāddahišn kaš *Kawād windād, "in recompense for that he found Kawād"; as Bailey has noted, no such a fire (whose name he read *Kawādagān) appears in Murj IV, 73ff.

85 Later confused (cf. Dhabhar 1932, 60) with Burzēn.Mihr.

86 SahrErān § 38: šahrestān ī Zrang noxost gizistag Frāsiyāb ī Tūr kard. ūš warzawand āta[x]š ī Karkōy ānōh nišāst ūš Manušēuhr andar ō PadišxVārgar kard ūš Spandarmet pad zanth xVāst ūš Spandarmet andar ō zamīg gumēxt. (Frāsiyāb) šahristān awērān kard ūš āta[x]š afsārd ud pas Kay Xusraw ī Siyāwu[x]šān šahrestān abāz kard ūš āta[x]š ī Karkōy abāz nišāst ud Arda[x]šēr ī Pābagān šahrestān bē frazāmēntd, "the city of Zrang was first build by the accursed Frāsiyāb ī Tūr. He installed there the mighty Fire of Karkōy, and he forced Manušēuhr into PadišxVārgar, and he (Frāsiyāb) asked Spandarmet to marry him, and Spandarmet mingled herself with the earth. (Frāsiyāb) destroyed the city and extinguished the Fire, then Kay Xusraw son of Siyāwu[x]š restored the city and installed again the Fire of Karkōy, and Arda[x]šēr son of Pābag accomplished the city".

22. Abārīg hān ī az Wištāsp xVadāyīh ka Dēn madan tā Sāsānīgān sar hend was nām ud was mar ud was šnōman, hamē āta(x)š ī Wahrām ōšmārīd was andar xVadāyīh ī Tāzīgān afsārd, was nūnāz hast, ēwag ēwag pad nišāstan ī dehbed paydāg.

23. Āta(x)š ī Farmgar rāy paydāg kū axVārīšnīg hamē waxšēd pad rōz dūd ud pad šab āta(x)š paydāg, ka ciš ēw pāk awiš abganēnd padīrēd, ud ka hān ī rēman abāz andazēd. az garmāh ī awē ō nazdik šudan nē šāyēd ud hic jādūg ī wināh.kār awiš šudan nē ayārēnd, gōwēnd kū pad kōst ī mān ī wēfgan⁸⁷.

22. The other (Fires were established beginning) from the rule/epoch of Wištāsp⁸⁸ until the end of the Sasanians, (Fires) of many names, of much number, of much propitiation, all (of them) considered as Fires (of the type) Wahrām, many were extinguished during the Arab rule/epoch, but many (still) exist even now, each of them known as having been established by a ruler of the land.

23. About the Farmgar Fire it is revealed that it blazes without food (fuel), smoke being visible during the day and the fire during the night, and if they throw into it something pure, (the Fire) accepts it, but if this is something defiled, it rejects it back. It is impossible to go close to it because of the heat, and no sinning sorcerer dares to get close to it. They say it is by the side of the abode of Wēfgan.

⁸⁷ So Bahār 1345[h.s.] (1966), 128, 337, who quotes from Muslim authors the forms Bēwqān, Bēfqān, Giyūqān.

⁸⁸ It seems noteworthy that the text does not mention (however, cf. Bf 18.18) here the Wahrām Fire of Samarkand, which antedates Wištāsp (cf. SahrErān § 2-5, Markwart & Messina 1931, 8-9): pad kust ī xVārāšn Samarkand šahrīstān Kayōs ī Kawādān bē pargand, Siyāwu(x)š ī Kayōsān bē frazāmēnid. Kay Husrāw ī Siyāwu(x)šān ōh zād ūš warzāwand āta(x)š < ī> Wahrām ōh nišāst. pas Zardu(x)št Dēn āwurd az framān ī Wištāsp šāh 1200 fragard pad dēndibīrīh pad taxtagīh ī zarrēn kand ud nibīšt ud pad ganj ī hān āta(x)š nihād. ud pas gizistag Skandar sōxt ud aadar ō zrēh abgand, "In the East, the city of Samarkand was founded (cf. Bailey 1943, 153) by Kayōs son of Kawād; Siyāwu(x)š son of Kayōs accomplished it; Kay Husrāw son of Siyāwu(x)š was born there, and he installed there the mighty Fire of Wahrām. Then Zoroaster brought the Religion / the Avesta and by the order of the king Wištāsp 1200 fragards were engraved and written on golden tablets in the religious script (in the Avestan alphabet, cf. Tafazzoli 1993b) and placed in the treasury of that (the Wahrām Fire of Samarkand) fire. Afterwards, the accursed Alexander burnt (it) and threw into the sea".

24. Gōwēd kū āta(x)š ēw ī ham.ēwēnag pad Kōmīš⁸⁹ hast, āta(x)š ī axVārīšnīg xVānēnd, pad ādur wāstar nihurtan nē šāyēd, kaš hēzm abar nihād, sōzēd, ud ka nē nihād, ham ēwēnag waxšēd. hast kē ēdōn gōwēd kū āta(x)š ī Farmgar hān hast.

24. One says there is a Fire of the same type in Kōmīš, called "the fire without food", there is no need to place nourishment (=fuel)⁹⁰ into the fire, so when one lays fuel on it, it (the Fire) is flaming⁹¹, and if one lays none upon, it likewise is blazing. There is one who says that this is (can be told also about) the Farmgar Fire⁹².

⁸⁹ Kōmīš², "opened place, dug up", 𐬕𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬌, ZorPhl kwmyš, kwms, Arm komš, ArabPrs qūmīs, cf. Bailey 1970, 62.

⁹⁰ Literally: "it is not possible to conceal the fodder".

⁹¹ The Ātaš Bahrāms are later said to burn without fuel and to have no fear of water, cf. Dhabhar 1932, 60.

⁹² Translated in Markwart & Messina 1931, 56, who rendered framkar as *producing grief*. For the fire, cf. Mas'ūdī, MurūJ IV, 74.

[TEXT VII] WZs 3.78-86, cf. Gignoux & Tafazzoli 1993, 54-57:

78. Ȫ.š āta(x)š ī *abzōnīg xVad andar Garōdmān bē dād Ȫ.š paydāgīh pad āta(x)š ī pad zamīg sōzišnīg Ȫ.š abzōnīgīh ēd kū har sardagān ō xVēš.cīhrīh [abzāyēned].

79. [Wēh.franāftar] hān ī andar mardomān ud gōspandān Ȫ.š xVārišn gugārdan tan *taftan cašmān rōšnēntīdan andar xVēškārīh.

80. Urwāzišt hān ī andar urwarān kē.šān andar tōhm dādag Ȫ.š zamīg suftan āb ayārdēntīdan ud *taftan padaš urwarān wiškōf. huniyāg hu.cīhr ud hu.bōd kardan ud bar pazzāftan pad was mizag gōhrēntīdan andar xVēškārīh.

81. Wāzišt hān kē.š andar abr rawišn dāred Ȫ.š tom ud tār ī andarwāyīg zanēd ud stabrīh ī andarwāy bārīg sabuk ud cīhrīg kardan ud tagarg widāxtan ud āb ī abr dāred paymānag hān tāftan sreškōmand ud garmōg kardan andar xVēškārīh.

82.⁹³ Buland.sūdaz hān ī andar asmān hān xVārrah kē.š menmānīh andar Wahram āta(x)š cīyōn kadag.xVadāy abar xānag kē.š abzōnīg.ōzīh az rōšn.waxšīšnīh ī āta(x)š ud frāz.sōzišnīh ī bōd ud pākīh ī gyāg ī stāyīšn ī Yazdan ud warzišn ī kirbagān.

78. And He created that bountiful fire in the Garōdmān-Paradise, and it (the fire) is manifest in the fire burning on earth, while its (fire's) bountifulness is that it [benefices] all the species to (the effects of) its own nature.

79. [the good propagator/confessor] is that which is in the humans and animals/cattle, whose duty is to digest the food, to warm up the body and to enlighten the eyes.

80. Urwāzišt is that which is in the plants, from whose semen it is produced, and whose (the fire's) function is to pierce the earth, to boil and to warm up the water, by means of what the plants make pleasant, beautiful and good-scented flowers, (also) to ripen the fruits and to transform them into numerous tastes.

81. Wāzišt is that which moves in the clouds and smites the gloom and darkness of the atmosphere and whose functions are to make the harshness of the atmosphere subtle, easy and natural, to melt the hail, to warm, with measure, the water of clouds and to transform it into warm drops.

82. (The fire) whose profit is lofty is that which is in the sky, is that xVārrah (glory) which is inhabitant in the Fire Warhrān, as the master of a house is on (his own) house, whose bountiful might (derives) from the brilliant blazing of fire(s) and from burning the scents, from purity of the place(s) of God(s)-praise, from performing good deeds.

93 Cf. Bailey 1943, 44-5.

83. Ȫ.š abāg druz ī mēnōg kō(x)šēd, parīg.karbān ī az drayāb abar āyēnd ud tanīgardiīh paymōxt dārend ud pad gand ud ahōgenīšn rōšnān petyārēntīdan ud pad jādōgīh dāmān wināhēnd ud zadan ud sōxtan jādōg ud parīg *wanīdan ud mādagwarīh pad šab xuftagān pāsbānēntīdan abāg Sroš ahlaw ayār būdan xVēškārīh.

84. Ȫ.š pad bun dām hamāg zamīg pad pāsbānīh bē ō *warzāwand ādur ī Farrbay ud *tagīg ādur ī Gušnasp ud purr.sūd ādur ī Burzēn.Mīhr cīyōn āsrōn ud artēštār ud wāstaryōš hēnd, abespārd.

85. ādur ī Farrbay pad Xvarrahōmand kōf. abar Xvārazm gāh grift ud ādur ī Gušnasp pad Asnawand kōf ī abar ādurbādagān ud ādur ī Burzēn.Mīhr pad Rēwand gar ī abar Pušt [ī Wištāspān].

86. Ȫ.š gētīg paydāgīh ī andar gēhān abērtar būd pad xVadāyīh ī Hōšang ka mardom pad gāw ī *Srisōg az XVānīrah bē ō abarīg kišwar hamē šūd hēnd pad nēmag ī rāh šab ēw pad wād ī škeft ādurpāyag ī abar pušt ī gāw pad se gyāg *dēsīdag kē.š āta(x)š padaš būd ō zrēh ōbast ud gōhrīg hān ēwag āta(x)š ī wuzurg paydāg būd ō se *baxšīhist pad se ādurpāyag bē nīšast hēnd ud hān xVad būd se xVārrah kē.šān mehmanīh abar ādur ī Farrbay ādur ī Gušnasp ud ādur ī Burzēn.Mīhr.

83. And it fights the mēnōg-"spiritual" druz-demon, those of parīg-forms, coming from the sea, who put on corporeal appearance, who oppose the lights through (their own) stench and faultiness, who cause the creatures to sin through (their) sorcery; whose (the fire's) duty is to smite and to burn sorcerer(s) and to destroy the parīg(s), but mostly to protect those who sleep at night, and to assist Sroš the righteous.

84. And on the basic creation, (Ōhrmazd) entrusted the whole earth into the guardance to the powerful Fire Farrbay, to the valiant Fire Gušnasp, to the wholly-profitable Fire Burzēn.Mīhr, as they are the priest, the warrior and the husbandman.

85. The Fire Farrbay took (its) place on Mt. XVārrahōmand in Xvārazm, and the Fire Gušnasp on Mt. Asnawand, which is in ādurbādagān, and the Fire Burzēn.Mīhr on Mt. Rēwand, which is in the Range/Chain (Pušt) [of Wištāspān].

86. And its (the xVārrah's) gētīg-"material" manifestation in the world was the uppermost during the rule/epoch of Hōšang, when the people, by means of the Bull *Srisōg, were going from XVānīrah to other continents, in the middle of the way, one night, because of violent wind, the fire-basin which was fixed in three places on the Bull's back, and in which there was the fire, fell into the sea, and instead of this (fire) there became this unique great Fire, divided into three; they installed (them) in three fire-basins, and they (the three fires) became three xVārrahs (glories), that (the xVārrahs/glories) inhabit the Fire Farrbay, the Fire Gušnasp and the Fire Burzēn.Mīhr.

[TEXT VIII] PY 17.11:

tō āta(x)š ī Ōhrmazd.pus [andar yazišn] yazēm. Ata(x)š ī buland.sūd yazēm [Warhrān pad ēwag.radagth], āta(x)š ī weh.franāštār yazēm [hān ī andar tan ī mardomān], āta(x)š ī frāxv.zīwišn yazēm [hān ī andar urwar], āta(x)š ī Wāzišt yazēm [hān ī dēw ī Spinjāy zanēd], āta(x)š ī abzōnīg yazēm [hān ī andar Garōdmān pēš ī Ōhrmazd pad mēnōgīh ēstēd], Ata(x)š ī nāf Neryōsang.dād yazom, Ata(x)š ī harwispēn mān mānbēd Ōhrmazd.dād ī Ōhrmazd pus ī ahlaw ī ahlāyīh rad yazom abāg harwispēn Ata(x)šān.

We worship you [through worship], O Fire, the son of Ōhrmazd. We worship the Fire of lofty profit [Warhrān in his unique aspect of *rat*], we worship the Fire the good propagator/confessor [which is in the bodies of human beings], we worship the Fire of abundant life [which is inside the plants], we worship the Fire Wāzišt [which smites the dēw Spinjāy⁹⁴], we worship the Fire Bountiful [which stands in the Garōdmān-Paradise before Ōhrmazd in the mēnōg-"spirituality"], we worship the Fire of race.navel, created by Neryōsang, we worship the Fire of the lord of all the houses, created by Ōhrmazd the righteous Ōhrmazd's son, the *rat* of righteousness, together with all the Fires.

94 Vd 19.40; GrBd 6b.14; WZs 3.81; PRDD 18d2.

[TEXT IX] Dk 9.12.4-5:

4. āta(x)š ī abzōn ī az Dādār Ōhrmazd ūš hān bē sūdāg andar mān dād pad ham barišnīh ayārīh.

5. ud ēdōn pad gōwišn guft kū: "ēdōnat kē man āta(x)š hēh rōyišn x^vēš pad harwisp mān kū rasēh ud harwisp wis ud harwisp zand ud harwisp deh ud ēdōnat burzānd āb ud urwar ud kē.z ahlawān frawahr ka.t bē pad abespārišnīh zōhr frāz barānd mardom ka ō tō hēzm frāz barānd xušk ī pad rōšnīh nigerēd ūš ēdōn guft kū ēn Adur ī Gušnasp.

4. The bountiful fire which is from the Creator Ōhrmazd, and it is created by Him in a house, by rubbing, by aid of bringing together.

5. And thus He spoke in the Word⁹⁵: "Thus is thy own growth, thou, who art My fire, in every house where thou arrivest, and in every village, every tribe, every land, and thus Water and Plants exalt thee, and also he who is the *frawahr* of the righteous ones, when they bring zōhr-libation to deliver to thee, when people bring to thee dry wirewood which observes the light; and one said that this is the Fire Gušnasp".

95 This passage was identified as a translation from Avestan by de Menasce 1983; gōwišn was but rarely used for "Avesta". I believe this usage here reflects the fact that even the quotation-introducing phrase was in Avestan.

[TEXT X] Dk 7.4.74-78 (Dkm 639.17ff.), Molé 1967, 56-7:

74. frestīd cand dādār ī Ohrmazd Wahman, Ašwahišt, āta(x)š ī abzōnīg pad aštīn...

77. ūš guft pad hān ī wīrān gōwīšnīh āta(x)š ī Ohrmazd kū: "mā tars! cēt nē abar tarsišn, warzāwand ī Kay Wištāsp! nēt ō mān tarist mad hēnd aštag⁹⁶ abargar ī paygambār ī Arjāsp, ūt nē ō mān tarist mad hēnd dō hāwand⁹⁷ Arjāsp kē sāg ud bāz xwāhēnd ūt nē ō mānēt tarist mad hēnd hān ī harwisp tarwēnīdār duz ī xwāstār gadag ī rahdār!

78. se hēm kēt ō mān tarist mad hēnd: Wahman, Ašwahišt, āta(x)š az ī xwāday ī abzōnīg ...".

74. Ohrmazd sent as messengers Wahman, Ašwahišt and the bountiful fire...

77. The Fire of Ohrmazd said in a human voice: "Do not be afraid! Because there is nothing for you to be afraid about, O powerful Kay Wištāsp! Those who have come to your abode are not messengers⁹⁸ of Arjāsp! Those who have come to your abode are not two similar to Arjāsp, wishing tribute and revenue! Those who have come to your abode are not all-conquering (men), greedy thieves, or highway men!".

78. We are three who have come to your abode: Wahman, Ašwahišt, and also the bountiful Fire of the Lord ...

[TEXT XI] Wizīgard ī Dēnīg 43, Molé 1967, 130:

ud se ciš abāg xwād dāšt ciyōn har 21 nask ī Abistāg ud āta(x)š ī Burzēn.Mīhr ud draxt ī sarwān.

"and he (Zoroaster) had with him 3 things: all the 21 Nasks of the Avesta, the Fire Burzēn.Mīhr and the cypress".

96 Cf. Yt 19.46 (ašt), where Dahāka and Spitilura Yimō.karēnt, "that who sawed Yima" (cf. Bd 33.1, "dēws who sawed Yim"), both Anghri-Mania's messengers, are mentioned together.

97 Or, xyōn, Hyonites; cf. West 1897, 68.

98 Two Pahlavi synonyms are used, aštag abargar and paygambār; abargar probably reflects Avestan uparō.kairīta-, Vd 19.13, 16, cf. Molé 1967, 187; the normal Pahlavi meaning of abargar is "god, divinity" (cf. Bd 18.16). It is possible that the semantics of this word were similar to those of Greek ὀργεῖλος or Hebrew מַלְאָכָה.

[TEXT XII] Vd 19.40:

yaštō xšnūtō trīθō paitī.zantō sraošō ašīlō huraošō varəθraja sraošō ašīlō āθre zaoθrā frabarōiš xruždranām aēsmanām āθre frabarōiš vohu.gaononām bəoiθinām āθre frabarōiš ātarēm vāzištām frāiīzaaēša daeum janām spanjāyram xwāsta xwāraθrā frabarōiš pərənām vīyžāraileiatīm.

⁹⁹Worshipped, satisfied, beloved, made welcome (is) Srōš, the righteous¹⁰⁰, fair of form, victoriously (is) Srōš, the righteous. May you bring offerings to the fire, may you bring (offerings of) hard-wood to the fire, may you bring (as offerings) *good-colored incense to the fire, offer up sacrifice to the Vāzišt-fire, which smites the demon Spanjāyra, may you bring (as offerings) the cooked meal and *???

Pvd 19.40:

[ka] yašt [stōš] nušnūd [Srōš] ud frānart [kū dārišn bē kard] padīrīft Srōš ī ahlaw ī hurust pērōzgar Srōš ī ahlaw. ō āta(x)š zōhr frāz barēh [hān] ī saxt hēzum ō āta(x)š frāz barēh [hān] ī hu.gōn.bōd ō āta(x)š frāz barēh. āta(x)š ī Wāzišt frāz yazīšn [kē] dēw zanēd Spinjāy, xwārišn ī puxt frāz barišn purr ī [bē āšixt] šēr... [New Persian, cf. Dastoor Hoshang Jamasp 1907, 639 n. 12: yasnt xwarišna e šir o berin].

[When] the ceremony [of the fourth morning after death] is contented [Srōš] and promoted [is held], (then) Srōš, the righteous, well-grown, victorious is accepted. May you bring zōhr to the fire, may you bring this hard wood-fuel to the fire, may you bring scent of good kind to the fire. The Wāzišt-fire must be worshipped, this which smites the dēw Spinjāy, the cooked food must be offered, full of overflowing milk... [New Persian: i.e., a meal of milk and rice].

⁹⁹ The partial translation by Kreyenbroeck 1985, 173 was adopted.

¹⁰⁰ Kreyenbroeck translated this word as "accompanied by rewards". Though correct etymologically, nevertheless, for stylistic reasons "the righteous" seems to me preferable in the context of my discussion.

[TEXT I] Dk 9.8; DkM 792; DkS XVII, 12-3; DkD *missing folios* 146.7-147.7; West 1892, 180-1:

1. haftom fragard Tāwrat (tā vā uruuātā) abar nīmāyīšn ī ō Zardu(x)št ēwēnag ī 4 āwām ī andar Zardu(x)štān hazangrō[k]zim.
2. fradom zarrēn hān kē padaš ōhrmazd ō Zardu(x)št Dēn nīmūd.
3. didīgar semēn hān kē padaš Wištāsp az Zardu(x)št Dēn padtrift.
4. sidīgar pōlāwadēn hān āwām kē ahlayīh ārastār Adurpād ī Mahraspandān andar zād.
5. cahārom āhan *abar *zam gumēxt āwām ēn kē andar frāy zāyīšnīh ī *pādixšāhīh ī ahlamōy ud abārīg wattarān. abar wišōbišn ī Dēn ud xwadāyīh ud nīzārīh ī har gōnag wehīh ud nēwagīh ud frōd waštān ī xēm ud xrad az ērān dehānandar ham āwām.
6. ōšmurīšn ī was.skeftīh ud zaxmīhistan¹ ī āwām ō hān grāyīh² ī wehān *ō zīndagīh ī andar abāyīšnīgīh bawēd.
7. pahlom ahlayīh ābadīh hast.

1. The seventh fragard, tā vā uruuātā, is about the exhibition to Zoroaster of the nature of the four ages during Zoroaster's millenium.
2. First, the golden, in which Ohrmazd demonstrated the Religion to Zoroaster.
3. Second, the silver, in which Wištāsp received the Religion from Zoroaster.
4. Third, the steel, the age in which Adurpād ī Mahraspandān, the restorer of righteousness, was born.
5. Forth, the age of iron mixed with earth in which there is much propogation of the heretics and other sinners, about turmoil of the Religion and the State and weakening of every kind of goodness and virtue and the disappearance of the dignity (xēm) and wisdom from the Iranian countries in the same age.
6. On account of the many distresses and *torments³ of the age for the desire of the life of the good ones which subsists in seemliness.
7. Perfect righteousness is excellence.

1 Cereti 1995, 170: *zamistān, "winter".

2 *ibid.*, *grāyīšn, "desire".

3 Cereti 1995, 170: **winters".

[TEXT II] Y 31.14:

tā ōšā parasā Ahurā	yā zī āitī jōnghaiticā
yā īšudō dadəntē	dāōranam hacā ašāonō
yāscā Mazdā drəguuō.dəbiio	yaθā tā anhen hōnkarətā hilaī

I ask you, O Ahura Mazda, about the things that are approaching and will reach [us], about the invigorating gifts people will obtain from the truthful one or from the deceitful, and how they will be there when the reckoning [takes place]⁴.

[TEXT III] PY 31.14:

hān ī har dō az tō pūrsom ōhrmazd kē mad kē.z rasēd,
 kē abām dahēd az dās⁵ran⁵ az hān ō awē ī ahlāw
 [az hān cīyōn abāyēd dādan]. ōhrmazd kē.z ō druwandān
 cīyōn awēšān hēnd hangirdīgīh ēdōn [ēn kū awē dādestān
 cē awē dādestān cē am bē gōwī].

I ask you about the two things, O Ohrmazd, that have come and that will reach. What period is given by the reward from that righteous one [what should be given to him], O Ohrmazd, and from the deceitful ones, how they are when the completion (of times) takes place [that is, tell (me) what will be the judgement of him, the judgement of me!].

In the summary of the Warštmanš⁵r Nask this passage is alluded to as follows:

4 Translation by Humbach & Ichaporia 1994, 37.

5 Avestan dāōrā, "gift, reward".

[TEXT IV] Dk 9.31.18:

ud wuzurg mizdih t awē kē ō mard t ahlaw az x^vēš xēr

das^{ar} rāyēnēd. ud ēnaz kū kē (ō) awē t druwand hān t

abāron ēmēd rāy dās^{ar} dahēd tam ayārēnēd, nē rōšnīh

The great reward of him who arranges gifts from his own property to a righteous man. And this, too, that whoever gives him who is wicked a gift, for the sake of improper expectations, assists darkness and not light.

[TEXT V] ZWY 1:

ZAND t WAHMAN YASN

Snāyīšn t dādār Ohrmazd t weh t abzōntg. t abzāyēntdār t x^varrōmand ud Amahrspandān! āfrēnišnīh t abēzag Weh. Dēn t Mazdeshān! tan. drustīh ud dēr. zēwišnīh ud ābād. xērīh ō rāy kē nibēsīhēd!

16

1. ciyōn az S[t]ūdgar paydāg, kū Zardu[x]št az Ohrmazd a.hōšīh x^vāst.

2. pas Ohrmazd xrad t harwisp. āgāhīh⁷ bē ō Zardu[x]št nimūd.

3. ūš wan. ēw bun padāš bē dīd kē 4 azg padāš būd ēwag zarrēn, ēwag asēmēn, ēwag pōlāwadēn, ēwag āhan abar xāk⁸ gumēxt ēstād.

4. ēgāš pad ēd dāšt, kū pad x^vamn dīd.

5. ka az x^vamn bē būd, ēš guft Zardu[x]št kū: "x^vadāy t mēnōgān ud gētīgān⁹, *nimāyēd, kūm draxt. ēw bun dīd kē 4 azg padāš būd".

6. guftāš Ohrmazd ō Spitāmān Zardu[x]št kū: "hān draxt. ēw bun kē tō dīd¹⁰ <hān gētīg hast t man Ohrmazd dād>

7. hān t 4 azg hān t 4 awām¹¹ hast t rasēd.

6 Anklesaria 1.1-11=West 1.1-5.

7 Cf. ZWY 3.6, pad āb.kirb, as one of the three transformations of x^varnah, cf. Bailey 1943, 29 n. 2; Gignoux 1986a, 58.

8 Gignoux 1986a, 57-58; *ibid.* 1986b, 342: the ideogram for xāk, 'PR, was read as *abar, thereafter "improved" to QDM, abar, through dittography. Cf. also Boyce 1984, 71-2, Boyce 1989b, 72 n. 58, Boyce 1991, 386, āhan abar gumēxt and āhan t xāk gumēxt. Cf. now Cereti 1995, 149, 133, 171-2: āhan abar gumēxt ēstād; MacKenzie *apud* Cereti 1995, 172, read āhan <t gil> abar gumēxt, thus making a complete parallel to Daniel. My emendation combines two different proposals made by Boyce.

9 An Avestan expression.

10 Anklesaria added here hān gētīg hast t man Ohrmazd. dād, taken from ZWY 3.21.

11 The 7th fragard of S[t]ūdgar Nask (Staota Yesnya, Y 31, tā ve urvātā, summarized). According to Gignoux 1986b, 342, the four kingdoms are those of Wlštāsp, Artaxerxes II, Xusraw I, Arabs. If the scheme was indeed an ancient one, but the work was composed in its present form after Islam, it may be a reflection of the three Iranian Empires, when the first and the last places were already taken.

Glorification to the good and holy Creator Ohrmazd, the radiant increaser and to the Holy Immortals! Praise to the pure Good Religion of Mazda-worship! Physical health and long life and prosperity unto him for whom this is written!

1

1. As it is manifest from S[t]ūdgār: Zoroaster asked from Ohrmazd for immortality.
2. Then Ohrmazd showed to Zoroaster the wisdom of the complete knowledge.
3. And he saw the trunk of a tree through it, on which there were 4 branches: one of gold, one of silver, one one of steel, and one of iron mixed with earth.
4. Then he considered it as if seen it as in a dream.
5. When he arose from sleep, Zoroaster said: "Lord of the spiritual and material existences, it seems¹² that I have seen a trunk of a tree, on which there are 4 branches"¹³.
6. Ohrmazd said to Spitāmān Zoroaster: "The trunk of a tree, which you have seen"¹⁴.
7. The four branches are the four epochs which will come.

¹² Translated by Cereti 1995, 149.

¹³ Note that, similarly to Jewish prophetic sources, it is implied here that Zoroaster is answering here an un-asked (by Ohrmazd) question.

¹⁴ *is the material existence created by Me, Ohrmazd.

8. hān ī zarren hān ka man ud tō [Dēn]¹⁵ ham.pursēm, ud wištāsp šāh Dēn bē padīred, ud dēwān.kālbud bē škenned [ud dēwān az aškaragih¹⁶] ō wireg¹⁷ ud nihān rawišnīh ēstēnd.

9. hān ī asēmēn xVadayīh Arda[x]šēr ī Kay šāh.

10. ud hān ī pōtāwadēn xVadayīh Anōšā[g]rwan Xusraw ī Kawādān.

11. ud hān ī šāhan.xāk.abar gumēxt ēstād duš.pādixšāhīh dēwān ī wizārd.wars ī xēšm.tōhmag ka dahom ī saddōzim ī tō sar bāwēd, Spitāmān Zardu[x]šēt!

¹⁵ Added by Anklesaria 1957 from ZWY 3.8.

¹⁶ Added by Anklesaria 1957 from ZWY 3.11.

¹⁷ Cereti 1995, 133, 149: wireg, "flight".

8. That of gold is that when I and you will hold a conference [of Religion], and the king Wištāsp shall accept the Religion, he shall shatter the daevic forms and the dēws will remain far from being visible and will take to flight and concealed movements.
9. That of silver is the reign of the Kayānian king Ardašīr.
10. And that of steel is the reign of Xusraw of Immortal Soul, son of Kawād.
11. And that of iron mixed with earth is the misrule of the dēws with dishevelled hair, of the seed of Aēšma-, when your tenth century will be at end, O, Spitāmān Zoroaster!

[TEXT VI] ZWY 3.19-29:

19. ūm dīd draxt ēw kē 7 azg padaš būd ēwag zarrēn ēwag āsēmēn
ēwag rōyēn ud ēwag brinjēn ēwag arzižēn ēwag pōlāwadēn ēwag I
*āhan abar xāk gumext ēštād.
20. guftaš Ohrmazd kū Spitāmān Zardu(x)št ēn hān I ō pēš
gōwom.
21. draxt ēw bun I tō dīd hān gētīg hast I man Ohrmazd dād.
22. hān 7 azg I tō dīd hān 7 āwām hast I rasēd.
23. ud hān I zarrēn xVadāyTh I Wištāsp šāh ka man ud tō Dēn hampursēm
Wištāsp šāh Dēn bē padīrēd ud dēwān kālbod bē škennēd ud dēwān az
āškāragTh ō wirēg ud nihān rawištTh ēstēnd ud Ahriman dēwān wišūdagān
abāz ō tār tom dušaxV dwardēnd ud pāhrēz I āb ud āta(x)š ud urwar ud
Spendarmat zamīg paydāg bawēd.
24. hān I āsēmēn xVadāyTh I Artaxšaōr I Kay kē Wohuman I Spand-dādān
xVānThēd kē dēw az mardomān judāg kunēd bē pālāyēd hamāg gēhan, Dēn
rawag kunēd.
25. hān I rōyēn xVadāyTh I Arda(x)šēr I gēhān ārāstār ud wirāstār ud hān I
Sāhpuhr šāh kē gēhān I man Ohrmazd dād ārayēd,
bōxtagTh pad sāmān¹⁸ I gēhān rawāg kunēd ud wehTh paydāg bē bawēd ud
Adurbād I pērōz.baxt I Dēn rāst wirāstār pad rōy I
*<widāxt> passāxtag ēn Dēn abāg jud ristagān pahikārēd ud abāz ō rāstTh
āwarēd.
26. hān I brinj xVadāyTh I *Walā(x)š¹⁹ I Aškānān šāh kē jud ristagTh I
bud²⁰ az gēhān bē barēd ud hān I druwand Skandar I Kelestiyāgt²¹ az jud
dēn bē abesThēd ud az gēhān wany²² ud apaydāg šawēd.

18 Cereti 1995, 135, 152: *dāmān I, "creatures of the world".

19 Cereti 1995, 135, 152, omitted the name, which seems to be a late emendation.

20 This is the the reading accepted in Anklesaria 1957, Widengren 1961, 187, Boyce 1984a, 92; Cereti 1995, 152, 184-5, read *but*, translating *Buddha*. On the word, cf. Bailey 1930-32b.

21 Pāzand: Akv[ān]i Gar I KaresyākTh.

22 *an.awēn? Pāzand: an.bīn.

19. I saw a tree on which there were 7 branches: one of gold, one of silver, one of brass, one of copper, one of lead, one of steel, and one of iron mixed with earth.

20. He, Ohrmazd, said: "O Spitāmān Zoroaster! this is what I foretell.

21. The trunk of a tree, which you have seen is the material existence created by Me, Ohrmazd.

22. The seven branches, which you have seen, are the seven epochs which will come.

23. That of gold is the reign of king Wištāsp, when I and you will hold a conference of Religion, king Wištāsp shall accept the Religion, he shall shatter the *daevis* forms and the *dēws* will remain far from being visible and will take to flight and concealed movements, and Ahriman, the *dēws* and their abortions will rush back to the darkness and the gloom of the evil existence, and the preservation of water, fire, plants and Spendarmat-Earth will become manifest.

24. That of silver is the reign of the Kayanian king Ardašāθr, who is called Vohuman son of Spendadād, who will separate the *dēws* from the men, purify the whole world and propagate the Religion/the Avesta.

25. And that of brass is the reign of Ardašīr the arranger and restorer of the world, and that of king Šāhpuhr, who will arrange the world created by Me, Ohrmazd, propagate salvation to the ends of the world, and goodness shall become manifest, and Adurbād of victorious fate, the true restorer of the Religion, will dispute, by means of <molten> brass ordeal, about this Religion with the heretics, and will bring it back to truthfulness.

26. That of copper is the reign of the Arsacid king Walā[x]š, who will remove from the world the heresy of idols, and the evil Byzantine Alexander will perish owing to the alien religion, and will go away unseen and unnoticed from the world.

27. ud hān. ī arzezen xVadāyih ī Wahrām ī Gōr šāh kē mēnōg ī rāmišn wēnāb paydāg kunēd²³ ud Ahriman abāg jādōgān abāz ō tār tom dušaxv dwārēnd.

28. hān ī pōlawadēn xVadāyih ī Xusrāw ī Kawādān šāh kē gujastag Mazdag ī Bāmdādān ī Dēn.petyārag abāg jud ristagān ēstād az ēn Dēn abāz dārēd.

29. hān ī *āhan abar xāk gumēxt ēstād duš.pādixšāyih ī dēwān wīzārd wars ī xēšm tōhmag, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št, hazārag sar ī tō ka sadōzīm ī dahom ī tō sar bawēd, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št.

23 Cereti 1995, 152, 184-5: *wēnāb.dāg kunēd, "will render visible".

27. That of lead is the reign of king Wahrām Gōr, who will make the spirit of peace visible, and Ahrīman will rush back with the sorcerers to the darkness and the gloom of the wicked existence.

28. That of steel is the reign of king Xusrāw of son of Kawārd, who will keep away from this Religion the accursed Mazdak son of Bāmdād, the adversary of the Religion, who will rise with the heretics.

29. That of iron mixed with earth is the misrule of the dēws with dishevelled hair, of the seed of Wrath, O Spītāmān Zoroaster! The end of your millenium, when your 10th century will be at end, O Spītāmān Zoroaster!.

[TEXT VII] ZWY 3.1-18:

1. pad Zand ī Wahman Yasn paydāg kū Zardu(x)št az Ohrmazddudīgār bār a.hōšth x^vāst.

2. ūš guft, [*hān kū Zardu(x)št]²⁴: "hām andar ēd dāman ī tō ahlaw.tar ud kardār.tar, dādār! ka man a.hōš bē kunēh, ciyōn wan ī Jud.bēš, Gōpat.šāh, ud Gōšt.Friyān ud Cihro(k).Miyān ī Wištāspān [hād Pēšōtan ī Bāmīg hast]²⁵ - ka man a.hōš bē kunēh ciyōn awēšān, pad Dēn ī tō weh wurrōyēnd, kū awē Dēn.burdār kēš abezag weh.Dēn ī Mazdēsnañ az Ohrmazd bē padTrift a.hōš bē būd ud ēg awēšān mardomān pad Dēn ī tō weh wurrōyēnd".

3. guftaš [Ohrmazd] kū²⁶: "ka tō rāy²⁷ a.hōš bē kunēm, Spītāmān Zarou(x)št, ēg Tūr ī Brādrōš ī karap a.hōš bē bawēd. ud ka Tūr ī Brādrōš ī karap a.hōš bē bawēd, Ristaxēz ud Tan ī Pasēn kardan nē šāyēd".

4. Zardu(x)št pad menišn duš(x)wār sahist.

5. Ohrmazd pad xrad ī harwisp.āgāhth dānist kūš cē meniđ, Spītāmān Zardu(x)št ī ahlaw.frawahr.

6. ūš hān ī Zardu(x)št dast frāz grift ūš [Ohrmazd mēnōg ī abzōnīg dādār ī gehān ī astōmandān ī ahlaw]²⁸ ūš xrad ī harwisp.āgāhth pad āb.kirb abar dast ī Zardu(x)št kard ūš guft [ūš Ohrmazd]²⁹, kū: "frāz x^varī".

7. ūš Zardu(x)št azaš frāz x^vard. ūš xrad ī harwisp.āgāhth pad Zardu(x)št andar gumēxt.

8. 7 rōz.šabān Zardu(x)št andar Ohrmazd.xradth būd.

9. ūš bē dīd Zardu(x)št pad haft kišwar [ī] zamīg mardomān, gōspandān kū har ēwag mōy cand tāg pad pušt, tāg tāg sar ō kū dārēd.

²⁴ A gloss is introduced.

²⁵ A gloss is introduced.

²⁶ A gloss is introduced.

²⁷ NP: accusative.

²⁸ A gloss is introduced.

²⁹ A gloss is introduced.

1. In the Commentary of the Wahman Yasn it is manifest that Zoroaster asked for immortality from Ohrmazd for a second time.
2. He said [*i.i.*, Zoroaster]: "I am the most righteous and the most useful³⁰ among these creatures of Yours, O Creator! If You shall make me immortal, like the Pain-Expelling Tree, Gōpat.Sāh, Yōšt the Friyān and Cīhrō[k]-Miyān son of Wištāsp [know that he is the illustrious Pešōtan], if You shall make me immortal like them, then people will have better faith in Your Religion - "he, the Bringer of the Revelation³¹, who received from Ohrmazd the pure Good Religion of Mazda-worship, became immortal" - and then those people will have better faith in Your Religion".
3. He, Ohrmazd, replied: "If I make you immortal, O Spitāmān Zoroaster, then Tūr ī Brātrōš the *karapan*, too, will become immortal, and if Tūr ī Brātrōš the *karapan* becomes immortal, it will not be possible to perform the Resurrection and the Final Body".
4. Zoroaster was displeased in mind.
5. Ohrmazd knew, through the wisdom of omniscience, what he, Spitāmān Zoroaster of the righteous *frawahr*, thought.
6. He took hold of Zoroaster's hand, He [Ohrmazd, the bountiful spirit, the Creator of the material Existence, Holy], He put the wisdom of omniscience, in the form of water, on the hand of Zoroaster, and He said [He, Ohrmazd]: "Drink forth!".
7. And forth Zoroaster drank of it. Thereupon, the wisdom of omniscience intermingled into Zoroaster.
8. For seven days and nights was Zoroaster in[side] the wisdom of Ohrmazd.
9. Thereupon, Zoroaster saw men and animals in the seven continents of the earth, i.e., how many hairs each one had on the back, and whither each one held his head.

30 Literally, *the best performer of good works*. Cereti 1995, 150: *the most active*.

31 Dēnburdar, compare the Manichaean dīnawar.

10. ūš bē dīd dār ud draxt kē³² cē, cand rēšag ī urwarān pad Spendarmat zamīg kū ciyōn rust ēstēd kū gumēxt ēstēd.
11. ūš haftom rōz.šabān xrad ī harwisp.āgāhī az Zardu[x]št abāz stad.
12. Zardu[x]št pad ēd dāšt kū: "pad xvamn ī xvaš ī Ohrmazd.dād dīd. az xvamn nē win[n]ārd³³ hēm".
13. ūš har 2 dast burd, hān ī xvēš kirb abāz mālid, kū: "dagr zamān xuft ēstēm ud nē win[n]ārd hēm az ēn xvamn ī xvaš ī Ohrmazd.dād".
14. guftaš Ohrmazd ō Spitāmān Zardu[x]št kū: "-t cē dīdpad xvamn ī xvaš ī Ohrmazd.dād?".
15. guftaš, Zardu[x]št kū³⁴: "Ohrmazd mēnōg ī abzōnīg dādār ī gehān ī astōmandān! dīdēm hangad³⁵ ī was.xvāstag kē pad tan hXusraibid.usraw³⁶ ud ruwān kirs³⁷ udnizār pad dušaxv bōd, ūm nē burzišnīg sahist³⁸.
16. ūm dīd driyōš ī nēst.xēr ī a.cārag ūš ruwān frabīh pad wahišt ūm burzišnīg sahist.
17. ūm dīd tawānīg ī nēst.frazand ūm nē burzišnīg sahist.
18. ūm dīd škōh.was.frazand ūm burzišnīg sahist.

32 Cereti 1995, 134, 151, reads here: *hāmōyēn*.

33 Cereti 1995, 134, 151, 179: *guhrāq, "woken".

34 A gloss is introduced.

35 Tafazzoli 1990: *fortunate, rich*.

36 Tafazzoli 1990: *duhusrāw*.

37 Pāzand *kurs*. Avestan *kaeraesa-*, cf. AiW 470b, Adj. "mager" (Indic *krśā/krśyati*. *kars* (variants: *karś/garś*)=nizār "feeble, weak", an antonym of *frabīh* "fat, stout", means "thin, slim, emaciated", Old Iranian **karsa*, Avestan *karasā* (AiW 469), Indic *krśā*, Elamite *kur-sa*. It is the first element in Avestan proper name *Karasāspa*, according to Tafazzoli 1990, 59. Cf. Latin *cracentes/gracilis*, Lithuanian *kurketi*, "to be ill-grown". Widengren 1967, 341 n. 5: ZWY 3.3,8 *karsayakti*, from Avestan *karasā*, AiW 469 [against Bartholomae's reading], as in *Nérangestān* 53 *ōšān kē bē rawēnd ē+karsayagīhā*, Avestan *aēte yōi fra.carantikerēsās.ca...*

38 Vocabulary of AWN.

10. He saw plants and trees, what and which they were³⁹, how many roots of plants there were in the Spendarmat-Earth, i.e., how they had grown, i.e., intermingled.

11. On the seventh day-and-night, He took away the wisdom of omniscience from Zoroaster.

12. Zoroaster pondered: "Have I seen this in a pleasant dream produced by Ohrmazd? Have I not yet woken from sleep?"

13. He raised both his hands, rubbed his own body over: "I have slept a long time, and I have not yet woken from this pleasant dream produced by Ohrmazd".

14. He, Ohrmazd, asked Spitāmān Zoroaster: "What did you see in the pleasant dream produced by Ohrmazd?"

15⁴⁰. He, Zoroaster, replied: "O Ohrmazd, bountiful spirit, creator of the material world! I have seen a rich man having immense wealth, who was honored in the body, and thin and weak in the soul, and he was in hell; he did not seem praiseworthy to me.

16. I saw a helpless poor man lacking any possession, his soul fat (thriving) in the Best Existence, and he seemed praiseworthy to me.

17. I saw a powerful person having no children and it did not seem praiseworthy to me.

18. I saw a person broken down having many children and it seemed praiseworthy to me".

39 Cereti 1995, 151 (cf. also nn. 8-9) translated differently.

40 Translated in Tafazzoli 1990, 56.

[TEXT VIII] ZWY 2⁴¹:

1. pad Zand. ī Wahman Yasn, Xurdād Yasn, Aštād Yasn⁴² paydāg kū ēw bār glizistag Mazdag ī Bāmdādān ī Dēn.petyārag ō paydāgīh āmad, ūšān petyāragīh pad Dēn ī Yazdān kard.

2.⁴³ hān ī Anōšag.ruwān Xusraw ī Kawādān, Xusraw⁴⁴ ī Mahdādān⁴⁵, Nēw.Sāhpuhr⁴⁶ ī Dād.Ohrmazd⁴⁷ ī Adurbadagān.dastwar ud Adur.Farrōbag⁴⁸ ī adrō ud Adurbad [r⁴⁹] Adur.Mihr ud Baxt.āfarīd ō pēš xVāst.

3. ūš paymān azēš xVāst kū: "ēn Yasnīh pad nihān ma dārēd, bē, pad paywand ī šmāh Zand mā cāšēd!".

4. awēšān andar Xusraw paymān kard.

41 Anklesaria 2.1-4 = West 1.6-8.

42 Cf. Widengren 1983a, 104, 119; Gignoux 1986b, 337.

43 Gignoux 1986a, 55 n. 10.

44 On the names, cf. de Menasce 1983, 1171-2 and now also Cereti 1995, 175-6.

45 Or, *May- +Windādān, cf. Shaked 1969, 191. Cereti 1995, 134, proposes *Māhdād.

46 Cf. Gignoux 1986, 55. Shaked 1969, 169, read Weh.Sāhpuhr.

47 The name is found in the Pahlavi Yasna, cf. Cereti, *ibid.*

48 Cereti, *ibid.*: Farrōbay.

49 Gignoux 1986a, 58.

1. In the *Zand[s]* of the Wahman Yasn, Xurđād Yasn and Aštād Yasn it is manifest that once the accursed Mazdak son of Bāmdād, the adversary of the Religion, appeared, and they caused onslaught of evil to the Religion of Yazdān.

2. He, Xusraw of Immortal Soul, son of Kawād, summoned to his presence Xusraw son of Mahidād, Nēw.Sāhpuhr son of Dād.Ōhrmazd, the dastwar of Adarbadagān, Adur.Farrōbag the guileless, Adurbād of (the Fire) Adur.Mihr and Baxt.āfarīd.

3. He demanded of them a treaty, saying: "Do not keep these Yasnas in concealment, but, do not teach these *Zands* to others than your relatives!".

4. The made the treaty with Xusraw.

[TEXT IX] Dk 9.6, DkM 790.9-19; DkS XVII, 8-9; DkD missing folios 143.6-144.4; West 1892, 178-9; Molé 1962. 73-4:

1. panjom fragard Xšmailbiš abar framuštan ī pid ō pūs ud pūs ō pid ud brād ō brād ud dōst ō dōst ud mānbad ō nārīg ud nārīg ō mānbad andar zamān handāzišn pad sērīh ud *hang; ud nē framuštan ī mēnōg ī Gāōān ō hāwandīg ōšmurdār ud srūdār ī Gāōān.

2. abar garzišn ī mēnōg ī Gāōān⁵⁰ ka ērbad ud dastwar pad

*uzdehīgīh⁵¹ bē widtrēd ud kirb ī hān mard abāz ō x^vēs būm nē rasēd hān rāy cē⁵² az hān bē andar hān būm zāyīšn ud stahmagīh ī ahlāmōyān bawēd.

3. ud abar abardar zōrīh ī mēnōg ī Gāōān hānēz ī rādīh pad bōxtan ī ruwān az dušax^v.

4. ābādīh pahlom ahlāyīh nast

50 Omit here ka Gāōān. West 1892, 178, read here *ka *dahīgān, translating: "although priest of the country-folk (dehīgāno)"; Molé 1963, 73-4, omitted the two words completely. This could be in accordance with the missing folios of MS B, thus the translation would be: "when the people of the land, when an ērbad and a dastwar...".

51 Or, *uzdēsīh, "idolatry", cf. West 1892, 178 n. 2.

52 Omit another dittographical cē.

1. The fifth fragard, Xšmaibīlā, is about the forgetfulness of a father for a son, a son for a father, a brother for a brother, a friend for a friend, a husband for a wife, and a wife for a husband in judgement of time, through satiety and festivity⁵³; and the unforgetfulness of the spirit of the Gāθās for anyone of the reciters and chanters of the Gāθās.

2. About the complaint⁵⁴ of the spirit of the Gāθās⁵⁵ when an ərbad and a dastwar passes away in foreignness⁵⁶, and the body of that man does not come back to his own land; for this reason, and besides that, he (the heretical high-priest?) is to be born in that land and there will

53 So (khang) West 1892, 178; Molé 1963, 73-4: hang, "opulence".

54 Cf. PY 29.1: ō šmāh [Amahraspandān] Gōšūrwan garzīd, "to you [to the 80untiful Immortals] complained Gōšūrwan"; Dk 9.29.1: šašom fragard Xšmaibīlā abar garzīdan ī Gōšūrwan, "the sixth fragard, Xšmaibīlā, is about the complaint of Gōšūrwan"; Dk 9.51.1: panjom fragard Xšmaibīlā abar ʔn kūš Gōšūrwan garzīšn kard, "the fifth fragard, Xšmaibīlā, is about that Gōšūrwan complained".

55 Note that the complaint here is that of mēnōg ī Gāθān, not of Gōšūrwan. The elimination of Gōšūrwan from the text and its substitution by mēnōg ī Gāθān was due to the anti-Mazdakite reaction. It is interesting that mēnōg ī Gāθān could be understood as an analysis of Gōšūrwan: -rwan, "soul", was analyzed as mēnōg, something like "spirit", and Gōšū- as Gāθān. In the last case, there is thus an indication that the second consonant of Gāθān was pronounced similarly to š of Gōšū-, i.e., as *g or *s (*Gāθān/Gāśān), but not as *h (*Gāhān). Earlier, Gōšūrwan could have been easily interpreted by Mānī as "Speaking Soul", gōwīšn urwān. Compare an interesting theory forwarded in Skalmowski 1984, which can be applicable rather to Manichaeism than to Zoroastrianism.

56 Or, "in idolatry", if the alternative reading is upheld; West 1892, 178: "in an outdistrict".

be obstinacy of heretics⁵⁷.

3. And about the higher power of the spirit of the Gāθās, and also of that (spirit) of liberality⁵⁸ in salvation of the soul from the "Bad Existence" (Hell).

57 The text of this paragraph is corrupt. There can be little doubt that the text speaks of Mazdak, the heretical high-priest, whose exegesis seems to have been based on the "Complaint of the Soul of the Ox", Y 29, to which Yasna Dk 9.6 pretends to be an abridged commentary. It must be observed that except the word "complaint", Dk 9.6 has nothing in common with Y 29, neither in Avestan nor in Pahlavi versions. Obviously, the original notions were suppressed. As the S[t]ūdgār Nask, to which Dk 9.6 belonged, contained much mythological material, it seems that the pre-Mazdakite, not censored original version of the fifth (Xšmaibīlā) fragard of the S[t]ūdgār Nask included, indeed, some material which could guide Mazdak in building his own mythology. Later on, the original pre-Mazdakite material was excluded and substituted by anti-Mazdakite propaganda. This paragraph must be read against a fragment of a much later composition, namely SnS 9.2-3, translated in West 1901, 309: "The priest (šsrō) who passes away in idolatry (uzdēsth) thou hast considered as desolate (wīrān); and there is a high-priest (dastwar) who is of different opinion, there is one who says he is as a non-Iranian country (an.Erān). It is declared that, when a supreme high-priest (zardu[x]štom) passes away in idolatry (uzdēsth), an apostate (heretic, ahlamōy) will be born in that dwelling, and a rumour of this calamity is uttered by that supreme high-priest (zardu[x]štom), šsrō[k] ka pad uzdehīgth bē wīrēd pad wīrān [Tavastia 1930, 116-7: *grān] dāšt ēstēd, ud hasl dastwar kē jud.dādestān. hast kē "šahr ī anērān" gōwēd. paydāg kū ka zardu[x]štom ew pad uzdehīgth bē wīrēd, ahlamōy ew andar hān mān bē zāyēd, ud ʔn grānīh ʔwāz pad zardu[x]štom guft ēstēd. It is not difficult to see that here in the SnS text two different interpretations of the same Zand are offered, going back to scribal errors, or perhaps to deliberate play on words with similar spelling and sound (wīrān/an.Erān) [cf. West 1901, 309 n. 3]. In our Dk text, "idolatry" (uzdēsth) and "foreignness, exile" (uzdehīgth) were confused [compare West 1892, 178 n. 2]. "Heretic", ahlamōy, "birth", "land" appear in both version as well. It seems that both SnS 9.2-3 and Dk 9.6.2 go back to the same source, with the version of SnS 9.2-3 offering a rather faithful quotation, while the version of Dk 9.6.2 was abridged. No doubt, this source spoke of Mazdak; the not entirely clear reference to "land", būm, in the Dēnkard version may refer to the cruel way Mazdak's supporters were executed (planted in a garden as trees with their legs upside). The reference to "foreignness/as a non-Iranian country" (uzdehīgth/an.Erān) may imply that Mazdak's views were seen as influenced by alien systems of thought (as they perhaps were indeed). On Mazdakite writings, cmp. Tafazzoli 1984.

58 Or, perhaps, "of the office of ra".

[TEXT X] Bd 33.12-29 (DT2 241.1-218.12)

12. pas hazārag ī cahārom bun būd adnar hān hazārag Zardu[x]št Dēn az Ōhrmazd padīraft ud āwurd ud Wištāsp padīraft ud rawāg kard, abāg Arjāsp kārezār ī škeft kard ud ērān ud anērān wasīhā abesīhēnd⁵⁹.

13. andar īm hazārag ka xVadāyīh ī Wahman ī Spandīdādān mad ud grān būd ērānīgān xVad pad xVad abesīhēnd ud az tōhmag ī xVadāyīh kas nē mānd kē xVadāyīh kard hād ūšān Humāy ī Wahman dōxt pad xVadāyīh nīšāst.

14. pas andar xVadāyīh ī Dārāy ī Dārāyān Askandar Kaysar az Hrōm dwārist ī Erān šahr mad, Dārāy šāh ōzad ud hamāg dūdag ī xVadāyān ud mogmardān ud paydāgān⁶⁰ ī Erān šahr abesīhēntīd ud was marag ī āta[x]š afsārd ud Dēn ī Mazdēsān Zand stad ud ī Hrōm frēstīd ud Abistāg sōxt ud Erān pad nawād kardag xVadāy baxt.

15. pas andar īm hazārag Artaxšaer⁶¹ ī Pābagān ī paydāgīh mad ud hān kardag xVadāyān ōzad ud xVadāyīh wīnard, Dēn ī Mazdēsān rawāgēntīd ud ēwēnag ī was wīrāst ī pad tōhmag ī awē raft.

16. andar xVadāyīh ī Sāhpuhr ī Ōhrmazdān Tāzīgān mad hēnd ūšān Horēw⁶² rōdbār grīft ud was sāl pad Ahwāz⁶³ tāzīšn dāšt tā Sāhpuhr ī xVadāyīh mad ud awēšān Tāzīgān spōxt ud šahr azāš stad was šāh ī Tāzīgān abesīhēntīd ud was maragīhā.šān ōh hāxt.

17. andar xVadāyīh ī Pērōz ī Yazdgirdān šāš sāl wārān nē būd ud mardom anāgīh ud saxtīh ī grān rasīd.

⁵⁹ The reading and translation of this problematic word are tentative.

⁶⁰ I am not familiar with this usage from other sources. Is it employed in the sense of the Arabic *aʿyān?

⁶¹ An elaborated historical spelling: *rtxštl, with š dotted.

⁶² That's seems to be the reading. Of course, it cannot be *originally* Arāna in the Iranian East (now Afghanistan); I suggest that the *original* text had here *Hīrā / *Hīrtā, only later, after the Arab invasion, having been corrupted into more familiar Harēw.

⁶³ Ahwār?

12. Then the fourth millenium had begun, during this millenium Zoroaster received the Avesta / Religion from Ōhrmazd and brought it forth, and Wištāsp accepted it and propagated, he waged a terrible war with Arjāsp and large numbers of Iranians and non-Iranians perished.

13. During this millenium, when the sovereignty came to Wahman son of Spandīdād, and these were difficult (times) and Iranians were perishing by their own hands, and there remained no man from the seed of sovereignty who could rule, then they seated on the (throne of) sovereignty Humāy daughter of Wahman.

14. Then during the rule of Darius son of Darius, Alexander the Caesar rushed from Byzantium and came to the Iranian Realm, he killed the King Darius and the entire ruling family and the Magi and he destroyed the distinguished men of the Iranian Realm, extinguished a large number of Fires, he took away the Zand of the Avesta / Religion of the Mazdā-worshippers and sent it to Byzantium, and he burnt the Avesta(n text itself) and divided the Iranian Realm among ninety petty kings.

15. During this millenium, Artaxšaer son of Pābag came to eminence and he killed these petty kings and restored the sovereignty, propagated the Avesta / Religion of the Mazdā-worshippers and established many institutions which were passed in his seed (=dynasty).

16. During the rule of Sāhpuhr son of Ōhrmazd came the Arabs and they seized the river-bank of Horēw(?), and for many years they made razziahs on Ahwāz, until Sāhpuhr came to power, drove away the Arabs and took from them the Realm, destroyed many Arabs kings and, perhaps, even converted⁶⁴ them in large numbers.

17. During the rule of Pērōz son of Yazdgird there was no rain for six years and people came to much harm and hardship⁶⁵.

⁶⁴ This meaning of "to convert into a religion" is well attested in the Zand texts (cf. Molé 1963, 509ff.; Molé 1967, 214; cf. also Chapter II). Sāhpuhr II (310-379) fought Arabs and the Arab tradition still remembered him as "the wrencher of the shoulders", many generations afterwards. However, the passage seems to describe a later period; the role played by Arabs on the Iranian frontiers later was rather unimportant; e.g., in 591 the Ghassanid Arabs invaded, on their own, into Iran. A decade later (circa 604?), after the Lakhmid principality was dismantled by Xusraw II and Nu'mān III died in prison, the Bakr tribe, allied with other bedouins, defeated the Persians in the famous battle of Dhū Qār. However, it seems that the compiler of this particular passage seems to have projected the situation during the early stage of the Arab conquest of Iran backwards in time, and does not refer to such border-episodes. The suggestion made by him that many Arabs converted into Zoroastrianism may be defined as sort of "[pseudo]-historical revenge". Conversion to Zoroastrianism is referred to in a passage found in *parallel texts* (Dk 7.8.49): ... pad yal.hāzīšnīh mardān ēg (Cīhrō[k]miyān) hāzēd hunsandīhā ud abunsandīhā, "... then he (Cīhrō[k]miyān) will convert people by heroic conversion, willingly and unwillingly".

⁶⁵ This very realistic situation was interpreted in apocalyptic terms in ZWY and other related texts.

18. did x^vašnawāz ī Heftālān x^vadāy mad ud Pērōz ōzad ud Kawād ud x^vāhar āta(x)š ew pad pad grawagān ō Heftālān burd.

19. andar x^vadāyīh ī Kawād Mazdag ī Bāmdādān ō paydagīh mad ud dād ī Mazdagīh nihād ud Kawād frēft wiyābān kard ud zan ud frazand ud x^vāstag pad hamīh ud hambāgīh abāyēd dāštan framūd ud Dēn ī Mazdēšnān az kār dāštan tā anōšag ruwān Xusraw ī Kawādān ō burnāyīh mad ud Mazdag ōzad ud Dēn ī Mazdēšnān wīnārd ud awēšān ax^vān kēšān asptāg ō Erān šahr hamāg kard spōxt ud wīdarg bast ud Erān šahr abē bēm kard.

20. ud ka x^vadāyīh ō Yazdgird mad wēst sāl x^vadāyīh kard ēg Tāzīgān pad was maragīh ō Erān dwārist hēnd Yazdgird pad kārezar abāg awēšān nē škōrēd⁶⁶ ud ō X^varāsān ud Turkeštān šūd ud asp ud mard ō ayārīh x^vāst ūšān anōh ōzad.

21. pus ī Yazdgird ō Hindūgān šūd ud spāh ī gund āwurd pēš az madan ī *ō X^varāsān uzīd ud hān spāh gund wīšuft ud Erān šahr pad Tāzīgān mānd ūšān hān ī x^vēš dād ī agdēn rawāgēnīd ud was ewēn ī pēšīnīgān wīšōbēnīd ud Dēn ī Mazdēšnān nizārēnīd ud nasā šōyīšnīh ud nasā nigānīh ud nasā x^varišnīh pad kard nihād.

22. ud az bundahīšn tā īmrōz anāgīh az ēn grāntar nē mad cē duškunīšnīh ī awēšān rāy niyāz ud awērānīh ud must kunīšnīh ud wad dādīh ud wad dēnīh rāy sēz ud niyāz ud abārīg anāgīh mehmanīh kard ēstēd.

23. pad Dēn gōwēd kū: "duš.pādxšāyīh ī awēšān sar kāmēd būdan".

24. grōh āyēnd suxr.nīšān ud suxr.drafs ud Pārs ud rōstāgīha ī Erān.šahr tā Babīl gīrēnd ud awēšān Tāzīgān nizār kunēnd.

66 Professor Sh. Shaked suggested, tentatively: "he was not broken [*škast/škandīd] (?) in the battle with them...".

18. Again, X^vašnawāz the king of the Hephthalites came and killed Pērōz, and Kawād and (his) sister brought a Fire to the Hephthalites as security.

19. During the rule of Kawād, Mazdag son of Bāmdād came to eminence and established the Mazdakite Law, he deceived Kawād and led him astray, and he ordered to keep women and children and property in common possession and in co-partnership and to abandon the Avesta / Religion of the Mazda-worshippers, until Xusraw of Immortal Soul, son of Kawād, came to maturity and killed Mazdag and restored the Avesta / Religion of the Mazda-worshippers, he drove away those chiefs who used to make inroads into the Iranian Realm, he closed the passage⁶⁷ and made the Iranian Realm secure.

20. And when the reign came to Yazdgird, he ruled for twenty years, then the Arabs rushed into Iran in large numbers: Yazdgird is not flowering/triumphant in the battle against them; he went to X^varāsān and Turkeštān to ask there for support in horses and men, and they killed him there.

21. The son of Yazdgird went to India and brought a large army; before its (the army's) arrival in X^varāsān, he went into exile and this large army was disturbed and the Iranian Realm remained in the hands of the Arabs; they promoted their own law of evil religion and caused destruction of many customs of the ancients, they humiliated the Religion of the Mazda-worshippers and instituted corpse-washing, corpse-burying, corpse-eating.

22. And since the creation till today, there came no calamity more severe. For because of their misdeeds - want and desolation; and because of acts of violence, bad laws and bad religiosity - want and other harm made their abode (in Iran).

23. The Avesta says: "Their misrule will arrive to an end".

24. A multitude will come with red ensigns and red banners, and will seize Pārs and the districts of the Iranian Realm upto Babylon, and they will humiliate the Arabs⁶⁸.

67 A clear reference to the building and military activities of Xusraw Anōšūrwān in Darband.

68 It is very difficult not to see here a reference to Iranian Resistance movements, while the passage was modelled on the propaganda of Wahrām ī Cōbēn.

25. ud pas ēwag ēw az kōstāg ī xʷarāsān āyēd, wadmard, ud awēšān Padišxʷārgarīgān spōzēd ud sāl ēw cand duš.pādixšāyih kunēd, pad sarth ī awē andar Pārs mardom bē abisihēnd bē ōzārag ī pad Kāzīrōn dāryā.bārthā tā bē nē mānēd.

26. az ēn pas hēn ī Turk ī was marag ud was drafš andar Erān.šahr dwārēnd, ēn Erān.šahr ī ābādān ud hu.bōd awērān kunēnd ud was dūdag ī ābādān wišōbēnd, ud was anāgth ud must pad mardomān ī Erān.šahr kunēnd ud was mānthā kanēnd ud wišōbēnd ud gtrēnd tā Yazdān abaxšīšn kunēd.

27. ud ka hrōmīg rasēnd ud ēwag sāl pādixšāyih rāyēnēnd hān hangām az kustag ī Kābulestān ēwag ēw āyēd kēš xʷarrah padaš az dūdag ī bayān ī Kay Wahrām xʷānēnd, hamāg mardom abāg awē abāz bawēnd ud padēz Hindūgān ud Hrōm ud Turkestan hamāg kustag pādixšāyih kunēd ud hamāg abārōn wirrōyīšn ul dārēd ud Dēn ī Zardu[x]št wīnard kas pad hēc *wirrōyīšn ō paydāgth nē tuwān madan.

28. ud andar im nihang Pēšōtan ī Wištāspān az Kangdiz āyēd abāg ēw sad ud panjāh mard ī ahlawān hān uzdešzār ī rāzgāh ī awēšān būd bē kanēd ud āta[x]š ī Warhrān pad gāhwārag nišānēd ud Dēn hamāg drust gōwēd ud wīnārēd.

29. pas panjom hazārag ī Hōšēdarān bun bawēd. Hōšēdar ī Zardu[x]štān pad Dēn nimūdār ud rāst paygāmbār az Ohrmazd āyēd ciyōn Zardu[x]št āwurd awēz Dēn āwarēd ud rawāgēnēd, tangth ud xuškth kāhēd ud rādth ud āstīh ud akēnīh ī hamāg gehān waxšīhēd. 3 sāl ō urwarān zargōnīh dahēd, rōd ī Vātāēni asp zahā bē tazēd, čašmīhā ī zrēh ī Kayānsēh abāz tazēd, 10 rōz ud šab xʷaršēd pad bālist ī asmān bē āstēd ud gurg sardagān hamāg bē abesihēnd.

25. And then, from the direction of the East, one bad man will come; he drives away those of Padišxʷārgār; he will establish his wicked rule for several years; during his leadership, men in Pārs will perish but few, which are on the sea-shores of Kāzērōn, until nobody will remain⁶⁹.

26. After that, the Turkish army will rush into the Iranian Realm in large numbers and with many banners, will desolate this prosperous and sweet-smelling Iranian Realm, will disturb many thriving families, will perpetrate much harm and violence to the men of the Iranian Realm, and will eradicate, disturb, and seize many mansions, until God will have mercy.

27. And when the Byzantines will arrive and rule for a year, at that time, one will come from the frontiers of Kābulestān, in whom there will be xʷarnah, of the lordly family, whom they call Kay Wahrām, and all men will support him again, and he will rule even over India, Byzantium, Turkestan, over all the frontiers; he will remove all impious beliefs and having restored the Avesta / Religion of Zoroaster, no person will dare to come in public with any other belief.

28. And in the same period, Pēšōtan son of Wištāsp will come from Kangdiz, with a hundred and fifty righteous men; he will eradicate the idol-temple which was the place of their mysteries, will establish the Warhrān Fire in its cradle and will properly proclaim and restore the Avesta / Religion.

29. Then the fifth millenium, that of Hōšēdar, will begin. Hōšēdar son of Zoroaster will come from Ohrmazd as the expositor of the Avesta / Religion and the true messenger. Just as Zoroaster had brought (the Avesta / Religion), he, too, will bring and propagate the the Avesta / Religion, distress and drought will decrease, liberality, peace, non-envy will grow in the whole world. He will provide to the plants the three yeras long greenness, and the river Vātāēni will flow with the strength of a horse, the springs of the Lake Kayānsēh will flow again, for ten days and nights the Sun will stand at the summit and the wolf species will be annihilated.

69 This passage seems to be heavily distorted. It can refer to Kawād, to Wahrām ī Cōbēn, or to someone else. However, it looks like the passage is out of place here. The next passage refers nevertheless clearly to Kawād's Mazdakite tendencies and to events prior to Wahrām's victory over the Turks. The beginning of the next passage is a later interpolation added to a piece of Wahrāmian *agitprop*; the reference to the royal xʷarnah is especially interesting here, as well as the notion of the Arsacid Restoration (mardom abāg awē abāz bawēnd). The idea that Wahrām will restore the ancient faith and impious beliefs refers to the opposition of the Zoroastrian clergy to "Christian sympathies" of Hormizd dethroned by Wahrām, and the ban on circulation in public (ō paydāgth) of heretical teachings ("beliefs", hēc wirrōyīšn), such as unauthorized (i.e., non-Sasanian) *Zands*. It is in this context that the Pēšōtan "small apocalypse" appears, when his function seems very much parallel to that of Wahrām, cf. Destree 1971. Pēšōtan is supposed, i.e., to restore the Warhrān Fire, the Fire of Wahrām.

[TEXT XI] ZWY 7.2-14,18,26; ZWY 8.1-5

ZWY 7.2-14,18,26

2. ... zāyēd Hōšēdar ī Zardu[x]štān pad war ī Frazdān [hād būd kē pad zrēh ī Kayānseh guft. hād būd kē pad Kābulestān guft].
3. pad sth sālagīh ō ham.pursagīh ī man ōhrmazd rasēd, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št! [hād būd kē pad kūst ī Cēnestān guft] [hād būd kē andar Hindūgān guft].
4. zāyēd Kay ēw [hād pid ī awē Kay az Kayān.tōhmag] [pad ayārth ō Hōšēdar *ō Hindūgān šawēd].
5. pad 1,000 sālagīh kāmāg ō zanān bawēd, ūš azēš zāyēd Kay ēw ī dēnīg, Wahrām ī warzāwand.nām xVānīhēd [hād būd kē Sāhpuhr guft]⁷⁰.
6. pad Dēn paydāg kū hān šab hān Kay zāyēd nišān ō gēhān rasēd, stārag az asmān wārēd [ka awē Kay zāyēd stārag nišān nīmāyēd⁷¹] [hād Dād.Ōhrmazd guft kū Abān.māh ud Wād.rōz] pīdar ī awē Kay frajām bawēd, pad kanzān ī šāh parwarēnd, xVadāy zan ēw bawēd.
7. awē Kay ka sth sālag bawēd [hād būd kē āwām guft] pad amar drafs spāh, spāh ī Hindūg ud Cēnīg ul grift drafs hend [cē drafs ul gīrēnd], abrastag drafs hēnd, abrastag zēn hēnd, pad tāzišn ul tāzēnd tā Wehrōd [hād būd kē Bōmē⁷² deh guft] tā andarag bār ī bahr ī bahrān, Spitāmān Zardu[x]št!
8. ka stārag ī Ōhrmazd ul ō bālist rasēd, Anāhīd rāy frōd abganēd, xVadāyīh ō Kay rasēd, was amar gund zēnāwand ārastag drafs hēnd.
9. [hād būd kē az Sēstān ud Pārs ud XVarasān, hād būd kē az War ī PadīšxVārgar guft, hād būd kē az Harēw⁷³ ud kōfestān guft, hād būd kē az Tabarestān guft].

70 My impression is that this paragraph cannot be post-Islamic.

71 Markwart 1930, 559 n. 92; Widengren 1960, 67 n. 234.

72 The reading is uncertain.

73 Compare Bd 33.16.

2. ... Hōšēdar the son of Zoroaster will be born on the Lake Frazdān [know that there was some one who said that it was on the Lake Kayānseh; know that there was some one who said that it was in Kābulestān].
3. At the age of thirty years, he will come to a conference with Me, Ōhrmazd, O Spitāmān Zoroaster! [know that there was some one who said that it was in the direction of China⁷⁴] [know that there was some one who said that it was in India].
4. A Kay will be born [know that the father of the Kay will be of the Kayānian family], [he will go to Hōšēdar to India for help].
5. At the hundredth year of age, he will have a desire for women; thereupon, an Avestan Kay called Wahrām ī Warzāwand will be born from him [know that there was some one who called him Sāhpuhr].
6. It is revealed in the Avesta that on the night when the Kay will be born, a sign will reach the earth, a shower of stars will rain from the sky [when the Kay will be born, the stars will show the sign⁷⁵] [know that Dād.Ōhrmazd said it was in the month Abān and on the day Wād]; the life of the father of the Kay will come to an end; they will bring him up with the maidens of the king, and a woman will be the ruler.
7. When the Kay will be thirty years of age [there was some one who mentioned the time], the armies with innumerable banners, the Indian and the Chinese armies having up-raised banners [for they will raise the banners aloft], having erect banners, having erect weapons, they will make razziahs upto Wehrōd [there was some one who said it was the Bumē village] upto the interior of the shore of the sea of Bahraīn, O Spitāmān Zoroaster!
- 8-9. When the planet Jupiter will reach its exaltation and cast Venus down, the sovereignty will reach the Kay, there will be innumerable troops having erect banners. [Know that there was some one who said that it was from Sēstān, Pārs and XVarasān; know that there was some one who said that it was from the lake of PadīšxVārgar; know that there was some one who said that it was from Harēw and Kōfestān; know that there was some one who said that it was from Tabarestān].

74 Not necessarily China proper is meant; Central Asia, the Chinese Po-szu (on which cf. Chapter IV)?

75 On comets in ZWY 7.6, cf. Panaino 1995, 102 n. 27, with bibliography.

10. ud az hān kūstag aburnāyīg ēw x^vāstār bē ō paydāgih āyēd [hād drafš ī ārstāg ud was marag spāh ī Padīšx^vārgar az Erān.šahr zēnīgan ud gund ud spāh[hādbūd kē guft kū Kurdaz Kirmānaz⁷⁶ x^vānēnd rāy paydāg].
11. pad Dēn paydāg kū pad ham.ayārīh ud ham.drafš ō ēn Erān.dehān *rasēnd ud was marag bē ōzanēnd awēšān xēsm.tōhmagān ī Sēdāspīhā, hēn ī frāx^v.anīg ud dām ī gurg ī dō zang ud dēw ī dawāl kūstīg.
12. pad Arwand bār 3 karezār kunēnd *ēwag *pad *Jalūla* ēwag pad Spēd Razūr, ud ēwag pad Dašt ī Nehāwandag.
13. [hād būd kē guft kū pad war ī sē tōhmag, būd kē guft kū andar Marw ī šēdān, hād būd kē andar Pārs guft.
14. ō pušt ī Erān.dehān amar spāh ī X^varāsānīhā abrāstag.drafš hēnd [*hād kū drafš ī babr.pōst dārend, ū.šān wād.drafš ud *bandōg*⁷⁷ spēd
18. pad dwārīšn dwārēd Gannag Mēnōg abāg dēwān ud wattar.tōhmagān ud xēsm ī xrwidrafš⁷⁸, bē ō pušt ud ayārīh ī awēšān dēwēsān xēsm.tōhmagān rasēd, Spitāman Zardu(x)št!

⁷⁶ The Kurds and the Kermanians?

⁷⁷ West 1897, 223 n. 6: "cotton", *pumbak*; Anklesaria 1957, 121: *bandōq "muskets"; Cereti 1995, 143, 163, 208, followed the reading and interpretation suggested by West. In Persian, words for "gun / shortgun" were in use for "crossbow" before the fire arms appeared; e.g., *tufang* is "a tube through which a thing is blown or propelled; a musket; pea-shooter; pop-gun" (Platts 1884, 329a). The meaning "crossbow" is especially well attested for the Ottoman Turkish *tüfenk*. Persian *tapanča*, Turkish (from Persian) *tapanca*, Arabic *ṭabanja*, "pistol", also had meanings similar to that of *tufang*. Arabic *bandūq*, *bandūqiyya*, for "firelock, gun, musket", is from Persian (*runduq*, Pahlavi *pondik*) for "bullet, ball" (cf. Platts 1884, 170a). However, it is not impossible that the Arabic name of Venice (*al-Bunduqiyya*, derived from the German form *Venedig*), played also some rôle in the etymology of the Arabic for "gun". The exact relation of the New Persian *bandōg* to Arabic *bandūq*, *bandūqiyya* must be studied.

⁷⁸ Cf. Chapter IV. Otherwise *alus.drafš, "white-bannered"?

10. And from that direction, there will appear those in search of a child [know that it will be the erect banner and the innumerable army of Padīšx^vārgar, the armed men, troops and armies from the Iranian Realm⁷⁹; there was some one who said that it is manifestly as regards those whom they call the Kurds and the Kermanians].
11. It is revealed in the Avesta that through mutual help and under the common banner those Sēdāspīans of the seed of Xēšm, the army with the wide front of the two-legged wolves and the leathern-belted dēws will arrive in these Iranian countries and will slay an large numbers.
12. They will wage three battles on the bank of the Arvand; at *Jalūla, one in Spēd.Razūr, and one in the field of Nihāwandag.
13. [Know that there was one who said that it was on the Lake of the Three Seeds (=Kayānsē, "[seed] of three Kays"); there was one who said that it was in the resplendent Marw; know that there was one who said that it was in Pārs].
14. For the support of the Iranian countries, there will be the innumerable troops of X^varāsānians having erect banners [that is, they will have the banner of leopard's skin; their banner and their *crossbows will be white].
18. The Stinking Spirit will rush with an on-rush together with the demons, those of the wicked seed and Xēšm of bloody club / banner, and he will come to the support and help of those demon-worshippers of the seed of Xēšm, O Spitāman Zoroaster!

⁷⁹ The banner here is clearly the banner of the Kay. Ya'qūb ibn Layl al-Šaffār, the founder of the Šaffārid dynasty, claimed in the ninth century 'Indī 'alam al-Kābīyān, "I possess the banner of Kāwa" (according to Stern 1971 544, Kāwa the Smith is a popular etymology for *kay, thus implying the connectin between Kay and banner); I would add that this legend about the smith might have been developed under the impact of al-Šaffār's own former occupation, though the mythological functions of smiths, including in dragon-fighting, are well attested in general folklore.

26. frāz rawēd Pēšōtan ī Wīštāspān pad ham.ayārīh ī Adur.Farrbay ud Adur.Gušnasp ud Adur.Burzēn.Mīhr ō uždēstīzār ī wuzurg ī nišēmag ī druwand Gannāg Mēnōg ud Xēsm ī xrwīdruš ud hamāg dēwān ud družān ud wad.tōhmagān ud jāddūgān. ō hān ī zoīāytom dušax^v rasēnd, bē kanēnd hān uždēstīzār pad ham.kō[x]šīšnīh ī Pēšōtan ī bāmīg.

ZWY 8.1-S⁸⁰

1. hān ī Wahrām ī Warzāwand⁸¹ rāy paydāg kū pad purr.x^varrahīh frāz rasēd ud Wistaxm⁸² frāz bandēd pad gāh ī mōbedān mōbedīh ud *ō gāh ī wizurd ī rāst ī Dēn gumārd, abāz wirāyēd ēn Erān.dehān ī man Ohrmazd.dād.
- 2.⁸³ āz ud niyāz ud kēn ud xēsm ud waran ud arešk ud druwandīh az gēhān bē nīrīśēd.
3. gurg.āwām bē šawēd ud mēš.āwām andar ayēd.
4. ud Adur Farrōbag ud Adur.Gušnasp ud Adur.Burzēn.Mīhr abāz ō gāh ī x^vēš nišīnēnd ud hēzm ud bōy dādīhā bē dahēnd.
5. ud stard ud abē.hōš bawēd Gannāg.Mēnōg druwand abāg dēwān ud tom.tōhmagān.

80 Anklesaria VIII=West III 39-44.

81 Cf. ZWY 7.5; amāwand / warzāwand are two Avestic epithets of Wahrām /Varəθraγna-, applied also to θraētaona and Saošyants, cf. Gnoll in Elr II, 511a.

82 I accept the reading of the name and the Interpretation given in Cereti 1995, 215-6. Previously, I saw here a title (of Pēšōtan, "a curbed temper", cf. West 1901, 229 n. 3).

83 Dk 6.23, Shaked 1979, 10-13, 237-8, 378; PT 89; GBd 182ff.

26. Pēšōtan son of Wīštāsp will proceed supported by the Fires Farrbay, Gušnasp and Burzēn.Mīhr to the great idol temple, which is the den of the evil Stinking Spirit, and Xēsm of the bloody club and all the demons and družs and those of the wicked seed and sorcerers will reach the deepest hell; they (Pēšōtan and his supporters) will destroy this idol temple struggling on the side of the illustrious Pēšōtan⁸⁴.

1. About Wahrām ī Warzāwand it is manifest that he will come forth with fullness of x^vamah, and will appoint Wistaxm⁸⁵ to the dignity of mōbedān mōbed, and having been commissioned to the genuine and true throne⁸⁶ of the Religion, he will re-establish these Iranian countries created by Me, Ohrmazd.
2. Avarice, need, revenge, wrath, lust, envy and wickedness will wane from the world.
3. The Wolf Age will pass and the Lamb Age will enter.
4. And they will seat again the Fires Farrbay, Gušnasp and Burzēn.Mīhr on their thrones, and will give them firewood and incense according to the customs.
5. And the wicked Stinking Spirit will be stunned and stupored with the dēws and those of the seed of darkness.

84 For older parallels, cf. XPh 35-41, KKZ 9-10, KKZ 14; KKZ 9-10 (Skjaerve 1985, 598-9): "And Ahriman and the devils there befell great blows and torment, and the faith in Ahriman and the devils left the land and was rendered unworthy of belief. (...) And the idols were destroyed and the abodes of the devils were dismantled (gwk'nyhy=OP viyakanam) and turned into a place (or: throne) and residence for the gods".

85 Cereti, cf. above, identified this person as the dastūr of Wahrām ī Gōr.

86 Anklesaria 1957, 125: "position"; West 1901, 230: "seat"; Cereti 1995, 166: "rôle".

[TEXT XII] Dk 7.8.40-43:

40. ud abar sazThistan ī pādixšāyīh az wadīrān ī ham zamānag ēnāz gōwēd
ku: pūrsīd Zardu[x]št kū: "hān Ohrmazd, kē *kēk⁸⁷ ud karab hān ī
dušxvādāyīm pad pādixšāyīh abāz ō wehān gumēxtēd?".

41. ⁸⁸ūš guft Ohrmazd kū: "hānāz, Zardu[x]št".

42. pūrsīdēš Zardu[x]št kū: "hānāz, Ohrmazd, kē awēšān ī hān ō xvādāyīh
abāz ō wehān gumēxtēd ēn cīyōn Kaisar ud Xākān?".

43. ūš guft Ohrmazd kū: "hānāz, Zardu[x]št".

40. And about the process of passing over of the authority from the wicked ones of all the periods.
This, too, that Zoroaster enquired, saying: "Those, O Ohrmazd, who are kēk and karap who
are the most evil rulers in authority, will they be mingled again with the good?".

41. ⁸⁹He, Ohrmazd spoke to him thus: "Even those, O Zoroaster!".

42. Zoroaster asked him, saying: "Those, O Ohrmazd, who are in power, will they be mingled
again with the good, people such as the Caesar and the Khagan⁹⁰?".

43. He, Ohrmazd spoke to him thus: "Even those, O Zoroaster!"⁹¹.

⁸⁷ The text has kay, rendered in Molé 1967, 89, as kēk.

⁸⁸ I omit here: guftāz Ohrmazd kū hānāz ō wehān gumēxtēd ēn cīyōn dōīor ud Xākān; cf.
West 1897, 103 n.2, Molé 1967, 88, lines 4-5.

⁸⁹ I omit here: "He, Ohrmazd, said to him also, saying: "Even those will be mingled with the good,
such as Caesar (written dōīorī) and the Khagan"; cf. the previous note.

⁹⁰ Clearly, a reference to the Byzantine and Turkic (Khazar?) rulers.

⁹¹ Translated into English in West 1897, 103, into French in Molé 1967, 88-89. This translation is
slightly different from both.

[TEXT XIII] Ttr Yašt Yt 8.56

nōit īōra airiā dāghāuuš frašusuiāi haēna nōit vōīma nōit pama⁹² nōit
kapastis⁹³ nōit haēnilō raōō nōit uzgarēptō drafšō.

Then neither would a hostile army have here reached the Aryan countries, nor would famine, nor
scabies, nor mange [?], nor a hostile chariot, nor the uplifted standard (of war)⁹⁴.

[TEXT XIVa] Yt 1.11

haēnaliāasca pərəθuuainikailā pərəθu.drafšailā ərəθwō.drafšailā
uzagarēptō.drafšailā xrūrēm drafšēm barəntailā əθa imilā nāmənīš
drənjailō framrauua vispāiš aīānca xšafnasca.

And of the hordes with the wide front, with many spears, with the straight spears/standards, with
the spears/standards uplifted, bearing the spears/standards of blood; then recite these My names
every day and every night!

⁹² New Persian renders by pām.

⁹³ New Persian renders by kīna, "Kratze".

⁹⁴ Translated in Panaino 1990, 79

[TEXT XIVb] PhlYt 1.11

ud hēnāz⁹⁵ ī frāxvānīg⁹⁶ [dušman būmāšan frāxv. hast kē gōwēd ēd
frāxvānīg kūšān pēšānīg frāxv Tōrk ī Tōrīg] purr.drafs⁹⁷ [kū drafs was
dārēnd] ud stēndag drafs⁹⁸ [kū tō(x)šāgīhā dārēnd] ud ul grift drafs⁹⁹
hēnd [cē fradom ul grēnd ud pas bē abrazēnd¹⁰⁰] kē pad wixrōnīh drafs
barēnd¹⁰¹ [pad rēš kardan ō mardomān]. ēg¹⁰² awēšān man nām¹⁰³
dranjēn¹⁰⁴ [kū warm bē kun] frāz gōw¹⁰⁵ [ēn fragard] pad hamāg rōz ud
šab¹⁰⁶;

And also the army with the wide front [the enemies whose land is vast; there is some one who
says: "frāxvānīg, with the wide front" means they have wide foreheads, being the Tōrānian
Turks] full of banners [it is, they have many banners] and having erect banners [it is, they
carry them diligently]¹⁰⁷, their banners are uplifted [because they first take them up and then
exalt them], who carry the banners with bloodshed [with wounding people]. Then speak these
names of Mine [it is, learn them by heart; speak forth this *fragard*] every day and every night!

95 haēnāliqsa.

96 parəθuuainikallā, appears also in Yt 4.3, 5.131, 9.18; there is a Pahlavi variant (cf. AiW 893)
frāxvkēnīg, "with vast hate".

97 parəθu.drafsallā.

98 arəwō.drafsallā.

99 uzagarəptō.drafsallā.

100 To this verb, compare abrazt drafs in PhlVd 1.7.

101 xruēm drafsām barəntallā.

102 aθa. But this is generally rendered by ēdōn, cf. AiW 64b.

103 imillā nāmānīs.

104 drənjallō.

105 framrauua.

106 vīspāš ailānca xšafnasca.

107 One may wonder whether the glossator of tō(x)šāgīhā for stēndag derived stēndag from
stadān, "to take" (as the gloss ul grēnd, "they take [them] up" suggests)?

[TEXT XV] ZWY 4.26:

andar hān ī škerf āwām, Spitāmān Zardu(x)št, pādixšāhTh ī Xēšm ī
xrwīdrus¹⁰⁸ ud dēw ī wizārd.wars ī xēšm.tōhmag, hān ī nidom bandag pad
Erān.dehān xVadāyTh frāz rawēnd.

During that perverse period, O Spitāmān Zoroaster! the authority of Xēšm of bloody club and
of the dēws having dishevelled hair of the seed of Xēšm, those basest slaves, will proceed to the
mastery of the Iranian countries.

108 Or, xurdrus.

[TEXT XVI] ZWY 6.3, 5-6:

3. guftaš Ohrmazd kū: "Spitāmān Zardu[x]št! pas az nišanag ī syāh, pādixšayih¹⁰⁹ az¹¹⁰ awēšān xēšm.tōhmagān¹¹¹ [ō¹¹² Mu]salmān¹¹³ dehān, druz ī Sēdāspīh ud Kelesiyāgīh *rasēg¹¹⁴. [hād Māhwīndād guft kū Hrōmāyīg bawēnd ud Rōšn guft kū suxr kulāh¹¹⁵ ud suxr zēn ud suxr drafš bawēnd. hād ka daxšag ī awēšān bawēnd].

5. ud sad.gānag ud hazār.gānag ud bēwar.gānag bawēnd druz ī Sēdāspīh ī Kelesiyāgīh, drafš ī suxr dārend. awēšān pad rawišn was tēzēnd ō ēn Erān dehān ī man Ohrmazd dād, tā Arwand¹¹⁶ bār. [hād būd kē Furāt rōd guft. tā ō *gundān¹¹⁷ ī Asōristān.mānišn. [hād *gundān ī saxt.āmār¹¹⁸ ūš Asōrīg.mānišnīh ēd kū mardom ī Asōrīg padaš mānēnd, ud hān ī awēšān nišēmag. hād būd kē gilistag¹¹⁹ ī dēwān guft].

6. ēdōn bē ōzanēnd hān ī awēšān xēšm.tōhmagān sad.gānag ud hazār.gānag ud bēwar.gānag ud abāz wardēnd; drafš nišan a.mār spāh ī awēšān dēwān ī wizārd.warsān bē rasēnd ō ēn Erān dehān ī man Ohrmazd dād ud hēn ī frāxv.an[t]ig.dušmen, Turk [ī] Karmīr. [hād ul drafš hēnd, cē drafš ul gīrēnd. hād pad was maragīh ō Erān dehān ī man Ohrmazd dād ciyōn buš ī asp bē ēstēd]. Turk ī duwāl kustīg, Hrōmāyīg, Sēdāspīhā ī Kelesiyāgīhā pad ham.rasišnīh frāz rasēnd.

109 The Pāzand reads here: syāh pādixšayih = syāh Jamagan, cf. Nyberg 1929, 53/351.

110 Cereti 1995, 140: ō.

111 The Pāzand reads here: xēšm tuxmagaqan+pādāšāhī dubār kustīgān turkaqan salmādīhān, cf. Nyberg 1929, 53/351.

112 Cereti 1995, 141: az.

113 Cereti 1995, 141: Sarmān.

114 Cf. also Nyberg 1929, 52/350-53/351.

115 Not quzībaš. *suxr* is a Middle Persian form, kulāh a New Persian one. We have not here *kulāf > New Persian kulāh.

116 Arwand is, according to a somehow tardy tradition, the Euphrates, so Furāt. The latter name was introduced after the Muslim invasion only. There are some hesitations about the precise localisation of the Arwand river, so the word was glossed. *Arang* is another likely reading.

117 The reading is not certain. The Pāzand has Dūvān, so Anklesaria 116, West 216-217: Yūnān (Greeks). I propose "fortress", "settlement", like in the Middle Persian (Gundēšābūr), preserved as the Kurdish term for "settlement" (gūnd). Cf. Cereti 1995, 200 (yōnān).

118 *saxt.āmār. Bailey 1930-32a, 65: hamēmār, "opponent", MX 1,37.1bid.66: pātmar "judgement", FP 122. Or, *saxt-āmār, "harsh āmār"? While trying to explain *Gundān ī saxt.āmār in ZWY 6.5 and maragīh, "number", in ZWY 6.6, compare Y 10.15, where gundān ī marānīg explained by dastag ī wattarān, "group of evil men", cf. DkM 405.21. *mar* ī dušxvarrah Alaksandar, "the man of violence ill-destined Alexander", Bailey 1963, 79.

119 grīstag-garēda "burrow liar, haunt (of demons)", Parthian gryhcg, "pit, prison", Tafazzoli 1990, 51.

3. He, Ohrmazd, said: "O Spitāmān Zoroaster! After the black sign, the sovereignty will come from¹²⁰ those of the seed of Xēšm to the Sēdāsp and Kelesiyāgīh demons (*druzs*) of the *Muslim¹²¹ lands [know that Māhwīndād said that they would be Byzantines, and Rōšn said they would have red caps, red weapons and red banners; know that these will be their signs].

5. The Sēdāspian and Kelesiyāgian demons (*druzs*) will be in hundreds and thousands and myriads, they will have red banners, their progress will be immense, they will pour into these Iranian countries created by Me, Ohrmazd, upto the bank of Arwand [know that there was some one who said that it was the Euphrates River], upto XXān¹²² the capital of Assyria [know that it is XXān of strict justice¹²³, its being the Assyrian capital means that the Assyrian people reside therein and it is their native country; know that there was some one who called it the burrow of the dēws].

6. Thus those of the seed of Xēšm will slay in hundreds and in thousands and in myriads and will retire; the banner, the ensign and the innumerable army of these dēws with dishevelled hair will arrive in these Iranian countries created by Me, Ohrmazd, the army having the wide front of the Turks and the Karmīr enemy [know that they will have a high banner, for they will hold the banner up; know that they will be in immense number like the hair in the horse's mane in the Iranian countries created by Me, Ohrmazd], the leathern-belted Turks and the Sēdāspian and Kelesiyāgian Byzantines will come forth together.

120 Cereti 1995, 160: "to".

121 Cereti 1995, 141, 160, 198: "Sarmān".

122 West 1880, 216, Widengren 161, 199, Eddy 1963, 15, Cereti 1995, 141, 160, 200, read here Yōnān, "Greek[s]"; this reading is referred to as a possible one in the beginning of this Chapter; Anklesaria 1957, 47, 199, read Dūvān. However, the reading depends on interpretation, and the way around.

123 Cereti 1995, 160: "[Greeks who are] hard to count".

[TEXT XVII] Dk 9.16.15:

Pēšōtan ī Wištāspān pad Kangdiz ī sad dandag¹²⁴ ud drafš kē andar hān
bēwar hān bulandāšn¹²⁵ kē syāh samōr dārend ud Dēn niyōšēdār ī ahlaw
az pasTh ī Pēšōtan ī Wištāspān.

Pēšōtan son of Wištāsp is in Kangdiz of hundred merlons / pinnacles and a myriad banners
/ spears, on whose tops they have (furs) of black marten, and the righteous auditors of the
Religion are those of the retinue of Pēšōtan son of Wištāsp.

[TEXT XVIII] Dk 7.8.47

ud hān zanēd Gannāg.Mēnōg abāg dāmān hān 3 azg ī paydāg kū druz yazēd pad
āgenēn.yazīšnTh ēdaz kē pad buland.pēšagTh rasēnd [pad asp] Turk dēwThēz
ī wīzārd.wars TāzTg ud Sēdāspaz ī Kīlīsyāg Hrōm[ay]Tg.

And this one (Cīhrōmēhan)¹²⁶ will strike the Stinking Spirit with (his) creatures, these
three races about whom is manifest that they worship the dēws by communal worship, who
are those who arrive as riders [on horses], Turkic demons with dishevelled hairs, Arabs, and also
the *Christian *Byzantine Sēdāsp.

124 Or, stēndag drafš "with erect banners", cf. Tafazzoli 1971, 199-200. Or, sad.gandak, "the
100-moated", as West 1892, 203, or sad.kandag, "100-moated", as Sanjana had it (DkS XIX 15.11);
Geiger 1935, 120-1: Kangdēz ī sad dandag "das hunderzinnige". Cf. Tolstov 1948, plates 40,
Teshik-Kala; 61-63, Kavut-Kala; Staviskij 1974, ll. 38, 156 (Nisa and Waraxsh). Boyce 1984b, 64,
and Williams 1990, I, 190-193, II, 89, 238-240, read in PRDD 49.7,13: 7. ūš kōšk asēmēn ud
dandānag zarrēn ūš cahārdan kōr andar ūš haft rōd ī nāydgā andar ūš haft murw
kēš panagTh pad xVadayih šayēd kardan andar....13. Pēšōtan ī ahōš ud a.marg ud
azarmān ud a.sōhišn ud a.pōhišn ānōh xVadāy ..., "and its (Kangdiz's) palaces are of silver
and (their) pinnacles of gold; and there are 14 mountains in it and 7 navigable (?; compare Dk 9.16.16)
rivers and 7 pasture-grounds, whose protection should be through his (Kay Xusraw's) lordship...
Pēšōtan, immortal, deathless, ant aging, without hunger or thirst, is there lord...". The Dēnkard
passage was transliterated and translated in Boyce 1984b, 65, and in Williams 1990, II, 240, where
Boyce read sad.gandag, "the hundred-moated", and Williams read stēndag, "the erect".

125 Boyce 1984b, 65: *bulandān, "those of the exalted ones"; Williams 1990, II, 240:

*burzišnTgān, "those of the exalted".

126 Or, Cīhrōmīyān, Cīhrō[k]l.Mīyan, cf. ZWY 3.2 [TEXT VII].

[TEXT XIX] Dk 7.8.2¹²⁷

hēd ēd abdīn wābartgānThistanaz ī pēš.kēdtgThā¹²⁸ agāhTh abar hān ī nahom
ud dahom satō[k]zīm az Abistāg paydāg hān ī nūn wēnābdāg ēdōnTh nīmōdār
hast cīyōn hanjarīšn ī Erān.xVadāyTh az Erān.šahr, wišōbišn ī dād, ēwēn,
ristag, pādixšāyTh ī wīzārd.wars buland.pēšag¹²⁹ Krisyāntg¹³⁰.

This is these marvellousness and truthworthiness, too, of the prophetic knowledge about the ninth
and the tenth centuries as manifest from the Avesta, which (the prophetic knowledge) is the guide
to the now visible circumstances, such as the transfer of the Iranian royalty from Iran, the
disturbance of law, custom, rite, the sovereignty of *Christian riders¹³⁰ with dishevelled hairs.

[TEXT XX] PHyt 11.6:

ēnaz Zardu[x]št saxVān gōwišnTh frāz gōw [ēn kardag] ka rasē ō
*Kelesyag¹³¹ ayāb ō gadagestān ayāb ō hān ī frēštārān ham.dwārīšnTh ēg
druwand dēwēšn ud jādūg mard ud zan ud parTg mard ud zan pad bēš frāz
tarsēnd ud frāz dwārend; *nīhānēnd dēw *nīhānēnd dēwēzāg ūšān zafar
bē gTred [az wināh] ūšān ēdōn rēšōšān rēšēd.

And pronounce, Zoroaster, this utterance [this section] when you come upon of *Christian, or
upon a den of thieves, or a gathering of deceivers; then the unrighteous demon-worshippers, the
male and female sorcerers and the male and female witches are frightened and distressed, and
rush away. It makes the demons disappear; it takes their mouths away [from sin] and thus
inflicts wounds upon them¹³².

127 Translated in West 1897, 94, and Molé 1967, 80-81.

128 On connected words, cf. Bailey 1990.

129 Cf. Dk 7.8.47.

130 Sic! I doubt that this passage may reflect any actual historical situation, such as Sasano-Byzantine
wars of the late 6th-early 6th centuries. My own impression is that it was composed from secondary
sources after the Arab invasion.

131 Cf. Kreyenbroek 1985, 101-2 [610].

132 Translated in Kreyenbroek 1985, 62-3.

[TEXT XXI] Dk 9.32.23:

ēg hān xVadāyīh bē barēnd kē pādixšāy hēnd kēk ud karap hānaz ī
 dušxVadāyītom kē pad deh abar ō awē ī huxVadāyītom andar mān ud wis ud
 zand ud deh. ēg har dō wāng barēnd kē hān ī huxVadāy ud hānaz kē hān ī
 dušxVadāy ud zand hān ī dušxVadāy ud ō awē ī huxVadāyītom xVadāyīh bē
 abespārīhēd.

Then they will transfer this sovereignty, whose rulers are the *kēks* and *karaps*, they who are
 the worst rulers in the land, to this who is the best ruler in house, village, tribe and land. Then
 both will raise their voices, this who is the good ruler and this who is the misruler, and the
 misruler will be smitten and the sovereignty will be delivered to him who is the best ruler¹³³.

[TEXT XXII] PY 32.14a

awē kē¹³⁴ pad grāmag¹³⁵ meht¹³⁶ bē pad hān ī kēkān¹³⁷ xrad¹³⁸ bē
 dahēd¹³⁹ [kē pādixšāyīh pad pārag dahēd pad xrad ī awēšān bawed kē pad
 ciš ī Yazdān kōr ud karr].

This one who (sells) greatness for wealth¹⁴⁰ gives into this wisdom of the *kēks*¹⁴¹ [this one
 who gives rulership for money, finds himself in the "wisdom" of those who are blind and deaf in
 the affairs of Yazdān]¹⁴².

¹³³ Translated in West 1892, 259, and Molé 1967, 211.

¹³⁴ ahyā.

¹³⁵ grāhmō.

¹³⁶ ā.hōiōōl.

¹³⁷ nī kāvayascī.

¹³⁸ xratuš.

¹³⁹ (nt) dādāt.

¹⁴⁰ Pahlavi *grāmak* is a transcription of the Avestan *grāhma* (Schwartz 1985, 478: "lucre /
 booty"), cmp. Henning 1944, 139 n. 5 (Sogdian *grāmē*, Parthian *grāmak*; cf. also Russell 1985). The
 Middle Iranian word, "wealth", seems to have been affected Arabic *grām* "fine".

¹⁴¹ It is impossible to provide a comprehensive translation of the Pahlavi version proper.

¹⁴² Molé 1963, 224: "Celui qui donne la grandeur pour des richesses le fait en suivant la sagesse des
kēk (celui qui donne le pouvoir pour de l'argent le fait selon la sagesse de ceux qui sont sourds et
 aveugles pour les choses divines".

[TEXT XXIII] PY 32.15a:

an.āyīš¹⁴³ rāy [ka bē ō ēn dēn nē āyēnd] bē an.bēn¹⁴⁴ būd kē¹⁴⁵
 kēk¹⁴⁶ ud karap¹⁴⁷ hēnd.

Because of not-coming [when they do not come into this religion] they became sightless¹⁴⁸, they
 who are *kēks* and *karaps*.

[TEXT XXIV] Dk 7.8.26:

bē awēšān dahēnd ō kēkān ud karapān ō mardom fšag¹⁴⁹ [wāstaryōš] ud ō
 mardom arwandāsp [arteštār] ēwāz ēw cīyōn mān ēdar pad gōšt hān ī meh.
 bahr kunēnd [kū.mān pādixšāyīh dahēnd. cīyōn ēdar pad gōšt bē dahēm hān ī
 meh grāmīg kunēm].

But they give to the *kēks* and *karaps*, to the husbandsmen [farmers] and to the people on swift
 horses [warriors] only, just as we here, they make the portion of the great man in meat [they
 give us power, just as here we give meat to one whom we make great and wealthy].

¹⁴³ anāiš.

¹⁴⁴ ā vī.nānāsā.

¹⁴⁵ ya.

¹⁴⁶ kavītāt/kauuītāscā, "kavay-dom"; for interesting remarks, cf. Testen 1989, 223.

¹⁴⁷ karapo.tāscā. Note that the order of karapo.tāscā kauuītāscā is inverted in the Pahlavi
 version, possibly, because *kēk* ud *karap* became a fixed expression.

¹⁴⁸ Though the general sense of the verse was grasped by the Zandists, their translation was based on
 the similarity of sound between non-connected Avestan and Pahlavi words; it was probably ā
 vī.nānāsā, rendered as an.bēn, "non-seeing, sightless", in this verse that aroused the equation of
kēk ud *karap* with *karr* ud *kōr*, "deaf and blind".

¹⁴⁹ Molé 1967, 85,279: "éleveur". In the *Sāhnām*, pasdyī corresponds to the Pahlavi
 wāstaryōš, the name of the agriculturist "caste", cf. Tafazzoli 1993a, 11-12.

[TEXT XXV] Dk 7.8.60=Dk 7.9.23:

ēg ka hān mard 30 sālag bawēd hān hampursēd ō Amahrspandān ī huxVadāyān
 ī hudehagān, fradāg andar rōz hān ī rōšn rōz bē paydāg ka axV ī astōmand
 a.gad ud a.must a.kēk ud a.karap [kū pad ciš ī Yazdān nē karr ud kōr] ud
 awisānīšn [kūš xVēš tan ciš ī Yazdān jud nē kard ēstēd] ud purr.āšixt
 ēstēd [kū wārān būd ēstēd] ud āb gyāg gyāg abāz ēstēd andar Erān.Wēz kū
 Weh Dāiti.

Then, when this man (Zoroaster's son) will be 30 years old, he will have a conference with the
 Bountiful Immortals, the well-ruling, the well-providing. In the morning, during the day, this
 lighty day will be manifest, the material existence will be without (violent) club, without brutal
 force, without *kēks*, without *karaps* [they will not be deaf and blind in the affairs of Yazdān],
 without separation [they will not separate themselves from the affairs of Yazdān] and fully
 irrigated [*i.e.*, there will be rain] and water will be again found in every place of Erān.Wēz,
i.e., Weh Dāiti.

[TEXT XXVla] [Ohrmazd Yašt] Yt 1.10:

yezī vaši Zaroθuštra auuš ībaēšš tauruaiš daēuuanam mašīianamca
 yāēwam pairikanamca sāθram kaoliām karapnamca mairiianamca
 bizaṇgranam aēšamaoyanamca bizaṇgranam vahrkanamca
 caθwara.zangranam.

¹⁵⁰If you want, O Zoroaster, to destroy the malice of daēwas and men, of the yātus and
 pairikas, of the oppressors, of the *blind and deaf ones*¹⁵¹, of the two-legged ruffians, of the two-
 legged aēšamaōys, of the four-legged wolves.

¹⁵⁰ Translation by Darmesteter 1884, 28.

¹⁵¹ Thus Darmesteter (italicized by me), having based himself on the Pahlāvi glosses; *kavš* and *karapans* is another possibility.

[TEXT XXVib] Phylt 1.10:

agarat kāmāg hād¹⁵², Zardu[x]št¹⁵³, awēšān¹⁵⁴ bēš¹⁵⁵ tarwēnīdan¹⁵⁶ ī az
 dēwān¹⁵⁷ ud mardomān¹⁵⁸ jādūgān¹⁵⁹ ud pairīgān¹⁶⁰ sāsātārān¹⁶¹ kēkān¹⁶²
 karapān¹⁶³ [ēd dēw āšnāg ēn mardom hān ī wadag a.mār ud jādūg āšnāg ud
 pairīg hān kēš pad jādūgīh 1000 margarzān kard ēstēd, sāsātārīh pad wehān
 ōh bawēd ud padaz wadtarān ōh bawēd, pad wehān hammōxtārīh ud
 frawardārīh ud pad wadtarān zadārīh ud stahmagīh. hast kē har dō zadārīh
 gōwēd cē weh wad zanēd ud wad weh zanēd. Abarang guft ēd sūr stabr andar
 sāsātārīh. frēhbūdīh ud abēbūdīh pad ahlāmōyān ōh bawēd ud padaz sāsātārān
 ōh bawēd ud ahlāmōyān frēhbūdīh Zand pad x^vardag¹⁶⁴ guft ūšān abēbūdīh

152 yezi vašī.

153 Zarduštra.

154 auuā.

155 [baēšā.

156 tauruallā.

157 dāēuuanām.

158 mašīlanāmca.

159 yāōwām.

160 pairikanāmca.

161 sāōrām.

162 kaōllām.

163 karapāmca.

164 Or, *x^vardīg.

If this would be your wish, O Zoroaster, to overcome their harm, which is of the dēws and (evil) men, of the wizards and witches, tyrants, *kēš/kavis* and *karaps/karapans* [know that dēws are (well-)known; these evil men are innumerable¹⁶⁵, and wizards are (well-)known, and the witches are those who have performed 1000 sins worth of death; the tyranny may occur among the good ones, and even among the worse ones; among the good ones by teaching and protection, and among the worse ones by destruction and oppression. There is one who said that both (the good ones and the worse ones commit) destruction, namely, as the good kill the bad, and the bad kill the good. Abarang said that it means that the meals are coarse under the tyranny¹⁶⁶. Excess and deficiency may occur among the ahlāmōy-heretics and it may occur also among the tyrants. And the excess of the ahlāmōy-heretics is what they spoke of the Zand as regarding food¹⁶⁷, and

165 Dhabhar 1963, 167: "these 'men' are to be regarded as wicked". The New Persian version, which has bad šumār (*wadag amār, where I read wadag a.mār), seems to support Dhabhar's translation, but it is to be observed that this version is longer than the Pahlavi ones and represents a slightly different tradition.

166 This may reflect a piece of anti-Mazdakite propaganda. Unfortunately, there is neither Sanskrit nor New Persian version for this interesting passage.

167 The translations by Dhabhar 1963 and Kanga 1964 are different here.

xVarīšn suy paymān dāštan ud sāstārān frēhūdīh apaymān kō[x]šīšnīh
 ū.šān abēbūdīh kem.yazišnīh ud kēk ud karap hān kē pad ciš ī Yazdān karr ud
 kōr] marānāz¹⁶⁸ ī dō zangān¹⁶⁹ ahlāmōyānāz¹⁷⁰ ī dō.zangān¹⁷¹ [ēd ahlāmōy
 sē ēwēnag, ēwēnag hān ī frēftār ud ēwēnag hān ī xvad.dōšag ud ēwēnag
 hān ī frēftag, ēd hān ī frēftār hān bawēd kē ciš ēw az dānišn wardēnēd,
 ka.š sē srōšōcaranām wināh pad kīrbag ayāb kīrbag pad wināh pad Dād bē
 nihād¹⁷², zī[wa]ndag druwand ud murdag margarzān. ū.š cāšīšn ud rāyēnišn
 ud ōsmurišn andar nē abāyēd ū.š patītih kār nēst. hān xvad.dōšag hān bawēd
 kē az pas ī ahlāmōyān andar bawēd, gōwēd ēd ciš hān hast ī ēn gōwēd
 margarzān, ū.š patītih kār nēst. hān ī frēftag hān bawēd kē pad abēzag
 menišnīh ud kīrbag menišnīh az pas ī ahlāmōyān rawēd, gōwēd kū agar hast
 agar nēst ciš hān bawēd ēn gōwēd. ū.š spaiēiti padaš kū.š patītih kār]
 gurgānāz¹⁷³ caḥar zangān¹⁷⁴.

168 mairīānāmca.

169 bīzangrānām.

170 aēšōmaōyānāmca.

171 bīzangrānām.

172 The New Persian version wrongly read HNHTWN't as binišānād.

173 vāhrkanāmca.

174 caḥwara.zangrānām.

their deficiency is holding one's nourishment (only) to the extent of one's hunger¹⁷⁵ and the
 excess of the tyrants is immoderate slaughter and their deficiency is lack of worship¹⁷⁶, and the
kē/s/kavis and *karaps/karapans* are those who are deaf and blind as regards the affairs of
 Yazdān] of the biped scoundrels¹⁷⁷ and of the biped ahlāmōy-heretics [know that there are
 three¹⁷⁸ sorts of the ahlāmōy-heretics. One sort is the deceiver, one sort is selfish, and one
 sort is deceived. Know that the deceiver is one who perverts a thing consciously, when he puts a
 sin worthy of three srōšōcaranām whips as a merit, or a merit as a sin according to the
 Law¹⁷⁹, the living as wicked and the dead as worth of death¹⁸⁰. And there is no need to teach him
 and to guide him and to study (with him?), and his repentance (patīti) has no value. This
 selfish one is that who follows the ahlāmōy-heretics, and says what says that one who is worth
 of death, and his repentance (patīti) has no value. The deceived one who goes after the
 ahlāmōy-heretics in his pure and meritorious way of thinking, and says things whether they are
 or are not; this he says¹⁸¹. And he is (worth of) spaiēiti¹⁸² and therefor his repentance
 (patīti) has value] and also of the quadruped wolves.

175 Obviously, a reference to Mazdakite teachings.

176 Dhabhar 1963, 169 n. 10, read *kem-pašnih, "deficient meal".

177 On this word, cf. Bailey 1963, 78-80. The normal Sanskrit gloss for marān is nrśaṃsā, "violent, cruel", but here it is hīśakebhyāṇa, cf. Darmesteter 1883, 258; the New Persian version has rāhzanān, "highway robbers", cf. Darmesteter 1883, 266, and Dhabhar 1963, 169 n. 11.

178 The Sanskrit and New Persian versions: two.

179 Obviously, polemics with encratic heretics who used a different Zand.

180 The Pahlavi text is corrupt here, as is also signalled by the Sanskrit and New Persian versions; probably, it would be preferable to emend margarzān to *ahlawān, "righteous", or the like.

181 The translation here can be only tentative.

182 Cf. Vd 3.41; cf. also Kanga 1964, 6 n. 3 and the translations of Kanga 1964, 6 ["he casts off (sin)"] and Dhabhar 1963, 171 ["(the principle of) spaiēiti in this case) (should be applied) to him"].

Saxaiša

As was previously noted, the *dramatis personae* acting in JN are Jāmāsp and Wištāsp, as in AZ¹⁸³, not Ohrmazd and Zoroaster as in ZWY. We possess another composition arranged in the form of a ham.pursagīh ("conference", questions and answers) between an Iranian king and his wise minister, where the latter interprets in eschatological terms the king's dream, while there are, too, numerous parallels between it and between JN and ZWY 4; the bulk of the verses deal with the first dream, the rest are only repetitions.

The composition in question exists in Old Church Slavonic (translated also into Mediaeval Slavic vernaculars), being generally known as *The Twelve Dreams of the king Saxaiša*¹⁸⁴, however, the composition has also other different names¹⁸⁵.

In this composition, the king Saxaiša of Иринъ asks his minister Mamera/Amira to interpret his dreams. Scholars (Veselovskij 1879; Polivka 1889, 188; Ol'denburg 1892, 135) have identified the name of the king as the Persian (actually, Parthian) *Sahinšah; the name of his city is given as Иринъ is some older redactions (from the 15th century), while in the younger ones it became Ерихонъ, Jericho.

Kuznetsov 1976b, 272-3, identified Иринъ as the Parthian form of *Iran; it is true, derivatives of *arya or *irē[n] are found among Iranian loan words in Slavonic (Old Russian irej, Ukrainian vyrej, Polish vyra), "Southern countries"¹⁸⁶. Kuznetsov also saw the alternative form of the name of the seer Mamer / Amer as reflecting the Parthian for *Mithra. The Slavonic of the composition is highly archaic, and Kuznetsov took the text as one of the most ancient literature pieces of the Kievan Rus', prior to 1224 CE. It was stated at an early date that the Slavonic composition has Oriental sources; Veselovskij 1879 and Ol'denburg 1892 looked for some Buddhist intermediary; however, Veselovskij was fairly aware of the possibility of an Iranian source / intermediary; it is well-known that there are some Old Russian texts of Iranian origin, like "The Story of Ruslan" (*Rustam), "The Judgement of Semjaka" (*Semāxa), etc.

183 AyJ 1.10-13 has a parallel in AyZ 35-8.

184 With variants: Saxinša, etc.

185 Cf. Polivka 1889, 189; Veselovskij 1879, 1-2. The texts are available in Veselovskij 1879, Polivka 1889, an abridged Serbian version in Bašič 1931.

186 Not quoted by Kuznetsov; cf. Vasmer 1976, I, 486-7.

Kuznetsov 1976b¹⁸⁷ noted the numerous parallels between the Slavonic text and the Zoroastrian New Persian Zarātust-Nāmah¹⁸⁸, edited in the 13th century (such parallels, indeed, do exist). This composition is built from the same sources as ZWY and JN (which were unknown to Kuznetsov).

Nevertheless, Kuznetsov went as far as trying to reconstruct for the Achæmenid and Sasnian Iran a "Mithraic" religion very similar to that of Zoroaster, but whose prophet was called Mithra. Doing that, he resorted heavily to Tibetan¹⁸⁹ texts dealing with the Bon religion.

According to Kuznetsov, there were two traditions in Iran, that of the Prophet Zarathustra, and that of Mithra; later, these "Mithraistic" (not in the accepted Western sense) traditions were incorporated into the Zoroastrian heritage, but in Tibet we still have (according to Kuznetsov) some remnants traced to Iranian emigrés from the 4th-5th centuries BCE.

In Tibet (thus Kuznetsov 1976b, 273), Mithra appears as the Prophet Mathur / Mathara, thus according to the Tibetan historian Sum-pa Mkhān-po (18th century) who used Tāranātha (accomplished in 1608).

In the Tibetan *Zhang-Zhung Dictionary*, Delhi, 1967, p. 6,18, cf. Haahr 1968, 37, the name is given as *dmu-ra*. According to "Ardho / Aradhoto", a Tibetan historian¹⁹⁰, Zarathushtra was the pupil of Mathur. Mathur was born in Pasargadæ (unfortunately, Kuznetsov did not give the Tibetan form¹⁹¹) and was contemporary with Cyrus the Great. His *Vita* was translated from "Iranian" (for Kuznetsov, it is Pahlavi) into Shang-Shung (Zhang-Zhung) and from it into Tibetan in the epoch of the king Khrī-srong, during 144 years¹⁹². The Tibetan book speaks, according to Kuznetsov, of Dualism, the begetting of Mathura, of the priests and the rites. Then, Mathura meets, in the Southern part of Iran, the God whose Tibetan name means "The Wise One" (*Mazda)¹⁹³.

187 Cf. also Kuznetsov 1986, 408-410.

188 It seems that Kuznetsov knew this New Persian text in the French translation of Rosenberg.

189 The Irano-Tibetan cultural and religious intercourse is indeed of big importance. On some problems associated with the topic cf., e.g., Tucci 1971.

190 Dr. Dan Martin of Jerusalem, a Tibetologist, informed me that no such a "Tibetan historian" ever existed; in Dr. Martin's view, the name seems to be wrongly read by Kuznetsov.

191 Gumilev & Kuznetsov 1970, 570f.f, and Kuznetsov 1973, 20, give the form Bar-po-so-brgyad (*Persian Parso-gard, the city of Persians*). But cf. Bailey 1976, 311-2: Pasargadai, the northern Achæmenian capital, "encampment of the Persians", *Ἰκροῦν στρατόπεδον*, from *Pārsa argadā, where *argadā* is the well known *ark/arg*, as the New Persian for "citadel", *Tājtīkī arkī Buxoro*, also the name of the Central Asian city *Argi*, Parthian *ṛrkpt̃y*, *hrkpt̃y*, *ερκοπτης*, *εργυβης*, Aramaic *arḥmā*, *arḥmā*, *arḥmā*, *arḥmā*, Syriac *ܐܪܚܡܐ*, "governor of fortress", the root of the Latin *arx*, *arceo*.

192 Kuznetsov, *ib.*, quoting *Dus-Pa rin-po-cheel rgyud gzer-mig*, Delhi, 1965, pp. 1127-1138, 1167.

193 If it be so, one would recall "a man should see Mithra on the sea shore" in Pahlavi apocalyptic tradition, but ZWY & JN remained unknown to Kuznetsov.

Kuznetsov 1976b, 277, compares the three texts, the Slavonic, the New Persian Zoroastrian and the Tibetan. For Kuznetsov, "The 12 Dreams of Шахнаша" and the Zarātūšt-Nāmah (13th century CE) both go back to the same source in which the **Vita Mithrae* was interwoven with the *Vita Zoroastri* [Zarātūšt-Nāmah].

Unfortunately, all this "New Tibetan Evidence for Mithra" is a result of wishful misunderstanding¹⁹⁴, the situation being very similar to that with the so-called "Achaemenid map from Tibet"¹⁹⁵. As far as I could see, there is no Mithra, no Pasargadae, no Cyrus in Tibetan, and our Slavonic text has nothing to do with the mystical depths of Shambala and Aryans from the Northern Pole.

Is Mithra traceable on the Slavic soil otherwise? There certainly was some knowledge of Mithra in Common Slavic in historical epoch, although no Mithra is known in Scythian. It is quite possible that the ultimate source of the Slavic Mithra¹⁹⁶ was Manichæism¹⁹⁷ - cf. the Slavonic and Russian¹⁹⁸ *mir* (миръ, міръ), 1. "peace", 2. "world", 3. "community", from "Mithra"¹⁹⁹, while the word is not found in many other Slavic tongues, cf. Polish *poko*, "peace", *swiet*, "world".

It is possible that I have a solution for the Seer's name which does not involve either Mithra, or Tibet altogether; we could assume a misspelling²⁰⁰ in the route of (supposed) transferring of the text from Glagolitic²⁰¹ to Cyrillic; Мамера 𐌌𐌋𐌌𐌋𐌌𐌋 , or better Мамира 𐌌𐌋𐌌𐌋𐌌𐌋 (I prefer these forms on Амер-) < *Жамсна (*sic!*) 𐌆𐌋𐌌𐌋𐌌𐌋 , from *Jāmāsp*. One could see easily how similar are the Glagolitic for M and Z, 𐌌 / 𐌆 , and for I and S, 𐌌 / 𐌆 (just upside down), for R and P, 𐌌 / 𐌆 (the same)²⁰².

194 Knowing but little Tibetan, I am very thankful to Dr. Martin, who kindly agreed to help me with things Tibetan and provided me with several bibliography items. However, all the conclusions are mine.

195 Cf. Gumilev & Kuznetsov 1970 (on which B. Mazar in the Hebrew newspaper *Maariv*, 4, 1972 is based), Heteny 1973, Kuznetsov 1973, Stronach 1977; Kuznetsov's views were quoted, sympathetically, by such a great Iranist, who also has a very serious Tibetologist background, as Sir Harold in his brief "Report" (Bailey 1975). However, cf. for a new evaluation of the related material in Martin 1994.

196 On Mithraism and Manichæism on the Balkan Peninsula, cf. Cumont 1915, 175-176.

197 Boyce 1975c.

198 Cf. Vasmer 1950 & 1967 *ad loc.*

199 Abayev 1971, 11, showed that the Scythian form of Mithra should be **mir*.

200 Similarly, there is no need, with Kuznetsov 1976b, to postulate a "Parthian" form for the Slavonic Шахнаша: it is merely *Шахнаша, *Šaxanšā.

201 Glagolitic, and not the latter Cyrillic, was invented by Cyril and Methodius *circa* 860. Some Oriental scripts, like Georgian, Armenian, Coptic and Hebrew were used in composing Glagolitic (Cyril knew Hebrew [cf. Minns 1959] and Arabic, serving as Byzantine envoy to Bagdad and Khazaria; it is possible that he was the author of one of the Greek translations of Quran). The Glagolitic was still used in liturgy in the 18th century by Croatian Catholics in Dalmatia.

202 Another possibility is *amira, from Arabic *amīr*. This would be a parallel to *šahinšāh.

How could the Slavs have got this text? The Greek intermediary is impossible (because of S of *Saxaīšā*); it looks like we might ascribe the transferring of the text to the Sasanian-Bulgarian ties during the epoch of the First Bulgarian Kingdom which were very strong - moreover, there were thousand of Armenians (mostly, Paulicians²⁰³) resettled in Bulgaria, forming the bulk of the civil administration. This link seems to be the most plausible.

In the Late Sasanian period and even later, after the fall of the Zoroastrian Empire, Western Iranian speech served as *lingua franca* up to the Slavic North²⁰⁴. Nevertheless, it is impossible to think of a translation of a written Middle Iranian literary text into Slavonic at such an early date.

The suggested original form of the name of the Seer, *Zam[a]sp-a, is actually indicating that the text disclosed under the extant Slavonic composition was a version of the Pahlavi *Jāmāsp-Nāmag*. This might reaffirm, in an oblique way, that it was the *Jāmāsp-Nāmag* that was the prime source of the Zand ī Wahman Yašt 4. The other way around, it would be impossible to tell why the supposed original names of Ohrmazd and Zoroaster, in their ham.pursagīn-conference, became changed to Wištāsp and Jāmāsp.

203 Cf. Ivanov 1925, 16ff., for Armenian sites in Bulgaria, and Menges 1979, 48.

204 Pritsak 1981, I, 28: "in the Northern Dvina basin, Čudian (Old-Estonian) and Middle Persian (Pahlavi) continued to serve as a means of international communication". In addition, one might conclude that it was the Western Middle Iranian impact on Turkic, Finnish, Eastern Slavic and Proto-Magyar that made possible, later, flooding of some of these languages by Iranian lexica, in its Muslim garb. Numerous Sasanian artifacts were found almost all over the Old Russian linguistic territory.

עבודה זו נעשתה בהדרכתו של פרופסור שאול שקד

מחקרים בפרשנות כתבי הקודש הזורואסטריים:

סוגיות בזנז

חיבור לשם קבלת תואר דוקטור לפילוסופיה

מאת דן שפירא

הוגש לסינט האוניברסיטה העברית בשנת תשנ"ט / 1998

נספחים